WHAT IS IN COMMON BETWEEN BIG TOBACCO, AIDS IN BLOOD AND CHEMICALS AND CANCER

Big tobacco companies are paying out more than $200 billion in health costs to U.S. states after finally admitting that smoking affects health and seriously cost the medical system. AIDS and the Krevar Commission in Canada found that the government and the Red Cross were late in responding to requirements to test for AIDS in blood, and now have to pay out huge amounts to those who contracted AIDS through blood transfusions. Now it is very possible that the chemical companies and governments who don’t respond to getting carcinogens out of the environment may become financially liable for the huge and growing costs of medicare and other costs of curing cancer.

NCI SAYS GET STARTED ON CANCER PREVENTION

"Occupational studies have played a major role in identifying well established environmental carcinogens, such as asbestos, benzene, arsenic, aromatic amines, coal tars, vinyl chloride, chromium, and wood dust. It is well established that primary prevention is the most effective means of disease control. This is particularly true of cancer. Source, " Measures of Progress Against Cancer Cancer Prevention, Significant Accomplishments 19821992, The National Cancer Institute (NCI), Washington, D.C.

EPA FOUND 55 PESTICIDES LINKED TO CANCER

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has identified at least 55 pesticides that could leave carcinogenic residues in foods. In a single meal, a person can conceivably consume residues of a dozen different neurotoxic or carcinogenic chemicals, from salad to wine, broccoli to oranges. Many cancer causing pesticides and industrial chemicals found in the environment and in our food tend to accumulate in fatty tissues, whether in fish, cattle, fowl, or people, stated, Dr. Samuel Epstein. In 1989, the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) announced that the residues of agricultural chemicals on fruits and vegetables eaten during a typical American childhood could be initiating
between 5,500 and 6,200 cancers every year. NRDC found that the cancer risk could be as much as 6 times greater for children aged 1 to 5 than for adults. In light of these facts, a consortium of 75 EPA experts ranked pesticides residues among the top 3 environmentally derived cancer risks. Source, ,Intolerable Risk, Pesticides in Our Children's Food, % Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Washington, D.C. Website at <http://www.nrdc.org/nrdc>

ATRAZINE PESTICIDE FOUND IN U.S. MIDWEST DRINKING WATER POSES CANCER RISK

Tap water across the United States, Midwest is contaminated by dangerously high levels of weed killer that pose a cancer risk to bottle-fed babies, an environmental group said Wednesday. The group's president urged the Environmental Protection Agency to ban atrazine and noted that water utilities are spending millions to clean chemical from drinking water. Atrazine, a chemical sprayed on corn, was found in tap water in 796 towns and cities in the nation's Corn Belt, according to a report by the Environmental Working Group. Atrazine, in high doses, has been linked to cancer. See full story the website <http://www.infobeat.com/stories/cgi/story.cgi?id=2560471752-73d>

ISRAEL REDUCED PESTICIDES AND IT RESULTED IN A REDUCTION IN CANCERS

In 1978, following a public outcry and threatened with legal action, Israel banned many toxic chemicals such as DDT and PCB's which had been directly linked in a 1976 study with breast cancer in women. Once Israel banned these chemicals, they began noting a significant decrease in the level of toxic chemicals found in human breast milk. Over the next 10 years, the rate of breast cancer deaths declined sharply, with a 30% drop in mortality for women under 44 years old, and an 8% overall decline. It was found that women with the highest blood levels of DDT had 4 times the breast cancer risk of women with the least exposure. While DDT is banned for most uses in Canada and the United States, it is used on coffee plantations, oranges, and other fruits grown in Mexico, Latin America and Asia. According to environmental medicine expert William Rae, M.X., 81% of 107 cancer patients with measurable exposure to pesticides had much lower than average levels of T and B lymphocytes (white blood cells). Source, ,Definitive Guide to Cancer,a source book written by W. John Diamond, M.D. and W. Lee Cowden, M.D. and Burton Goldberg, published by Future Medicine Publishing, Inc., Tiburon, California, 1997, see its website at <http://www.alternativemedicine.com/index1.shtml>
THE PROBLEM WITH HORMONE ADDITIVES IN COWS MILK

Insulinlike Growth Factor 1 (IGF1) is produced normally by the cow's pituitary gland. IGF1 circulates in blood to each cell in the body, coordinating cellular function. IGF1 regulates cell growth, division and differentiation, particularly in the young. High levels of IGF-1 in milk has been increasing linked to increased cancer in humans that consume milk and milk products (cheese, yoghurt, cottage cheese, etc.). However, in 1994, the chemical companies (Monsanto being largest producer) developed for the milk industry „Recombinant Bovine Growth Hormone‰ (rHGH) which helps the cows to produce 20% more milk. However, the growth hormone also stimulates pituitary production of IGF1 levels in the milk of those cows. Recently, Eli Lilly & Co., a manufacturer of rBGH, reported a tenfold increase in IGF1 levels in cows receiving the hormone. IGF1 is the same in humans and cows, and is not destroyed by pasteurization. In fact, the pasteurization process actually increases IGF1 levels in milk. Furthermore, there is suggestive evidence that IGF1 in rBGH milk reacts more with the body than in nonhormonal milk.

After the rBGH milk is consumed, IGF1 is not destroyed by human digestion. Instead, IGF1 is readily absorbed across the intestinal wall. Additional research has shown that it can be absorbed into the blood stream where it can effect other hormones. The Cancer Prevention Coalition reports that, „it is highly likely that IGF1 promotes transformation of normal breast cellular activity to breast cancers. In addition, IGF1 maintains the malignancy of human breast cancer cells, including their invasiveness and ability to spread to distant organs. (IGF1 has similarly been associated with colon cancer.) The prenatal and infant breast is particularly susceptible to hormonal influences. Such imprinting by IGF1 may increase future breast cancer risks, and may also increase the sensitivity of the breast to subsequent unrelated risks such as mammography and the carcinogenic and estrogenlike effects of pesticide residues in food, particularly in premenopausal women.‰

In an attempt to help some people, milk producers that don't use hormones are labelling their milk „hormone free‰. Ironically, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is siding with the chemical industry and has prohibited dairy producers and retailers from labeling their milk as "hormonefree.” The FDA states that such labeling could be "false or misleading" under federal law.

The chemical company, Monsanto, has teamed up with the federal government and is suing several milk producers for using the label. Source, <http://www.preventcancer.com/alerts/alert5.html>http://www.preventcancer.com/alerts/alert5.html

******************************************************************

THREE THINGS YOU CAN DO TO IMPROVE YOUR MILK
The Cancer Prevention Coalition recommends three things that you can do. (1) Do not buy or use milk from cows treated with rBGH. There are many brands without it, especially certified organic milk. (2) Contact your local supermarket and find out if they have a policy regarding rBGH and milk. Make clear that you would like rBGH-free milk available. And (3) write to Health Canada and the U.S. FDA and express your concern that they not restrict the labeling of rBGH-free milk. Source of this information is at the website <http://www.preventcancer.com/alerts/alert5.html>

HORMONE ENHANCER „DES‰ ASSOCIATED WITH RARE VAGINAL CANCER

In 1971, the Food and Drug Administration told doctors to stop prescribing DES, or diethylstilbestrol, to expectant mothers as a treatment option for preventing miscarriages because a rare vaginal cancer called clear cell adenocarcinoma was occurring at unusually high rates in daughters of women who had taken the drug. The disease most often struck at between 15 and 27 years of age. New research presented last week at a National Institutes of Health meeting found that women who were exposed before birth to DES appear to have an increased risk of health problems throughout life, including occurrence of the cancer later in life, miscarriages, ectopic pregnancies, stillbirths, premature births, and autoimmune diseases. Men exposed before birth to DES have an increased risk of genital malformations and, some studies suggest, testicular cancer. Two new studies in mice suggest that DES may affect future generations. Source, "DES Exposure Found to Pose Lifelong Risk. New Research Suggests Effects May Extend to Grandchildren of Women Who Took the Drug." Washington Post Health, 27 July 99, 9.

FOOD ADDITIVES AND CANCER, THE HOTDOG

Junk food, like hotdogs may well contribute to cancer. The Cancer Prevention Coalition (CPC) in Chicago reported that, „three different studies have come out in the past year, finding that the consumption of hot dogs can be a risk factor for childhood cancer. Peters et al. studied the relationship between the intake of certain foods and the risk of leukemia in children from birth to age 10 in Los Angeles County between 1980 and 1987. The study found that children eating more than 12 hot dogs per month have nine times the normal risk of developing childhood leukemia. A strong risk for childhood leukemia also existed for those children whose fathers’ intake of hot dogs was 12 or more per month. Researchers Sarusua and Savitz studied childhood cancer cases in Denver and found that children born to mothers who consumed hot dogs one or more times per week during pregnancy has approximately double the risk of
developing brain tumors. Children who ate hot dogs once or more times per week were also at higher risk of brain cancer. Bunin et al, also found that maternal consumption of hot dogs during pregnancy was associated with an excess risk of childhood brain tumors.

The CPC further reported that, "hot dogs contain nitrites which are used as preservatives, primarily to combat botulism. During the cooking process, nitrites combine with amines naturally present in meat to form carcinogenic N-nitroso compounds. It is also suspected that nitrites can combine with amines in the human stomach to form N-nitroso compounds. These compounds are known carcinogens and have been associated with cancer of the oral cavity, urinary bladder, esophagus, stomach and brain."


**********************************************************************

ADDITIVES IN CHICKENS AND TURKEY AND COLOUR ADDITIVES SUSPECTED

Gentrian violet is a carcinogen used to treat chickens and turkeys for diseases caused by fungus. It is added to poultry feed to inhibit mold. Nitrofurans (nitrofurazone and furazolidone) are added to livestock feed to increase the growth rates, particularly of pigs, chicken and turkeys. Another additive, aldicarb, has been associated with altered immune functions in women who consume food contaminated with small amounts of this additive.

Other food additives that may increase the risk of certain kinds of cancer include Blue Dye No. 2 (propyl gallate), and Red Dye No. 3 used to colour meats, smoked meats, salami, bologna (etc.). According to Michael F. Jacobson, Ph.D., of the Center for Science and the Public Interest, "these additives are linked with cancers." Source, "Definitive Guide to Cancer", a source book written by W. John Diamond, M.D. and W. Lee Cowden, M.D. and Burton Goldberg, published by Future Medicine Publishing, Inc., Tiburon, California, 1997, see its website at http://www.alternativemedicine.com/index1.shtml

**********************************************************************

THE DANGERS OF HOUSEHOLD CHEMICALS

Some chemicals found in the house can contribute to cancer. For instance, methylene chloride (also known as dichloromethane), the propellant used in many aerosol products, is carcinogenic. Although some products containing methylene chloride have been pulled from the market, this carcinogen continues to be found in many consumer products such as spray paint and stripper. More recently, it was learned that indoor latex paints used widely for decades contained
highly neurotoxic mercury-based fungicides. But it was not until 1990 that manufacturers finally removed most of these potent neurotoxins. The Cancer Prevention Coalition reports that long term exposure to indoor pollution can result in lung cancer, or damage to the liver, kidneys, and central nervous system. Certain cleansers and many brands of cat litter contain the carcinogen crystalline silica. Some car cleaning products contain formaldehyde.

******************************************************
SAFE ALTERNATIVES TO HOUSEHOLD CHEMICALS

Non carcinogenic alternatives are available. For example, Baking Soda is an excellent cleaner and deodorizer. Borax is an excellent disinfectant. Distilled White Vinegar is also safe and an excellent cleaner, available in both supermarkets and health food stores. Essential Oils distilled from plant oils, essential oils are less allergenic than synthetic fragrances. They add a pleasing fragrance to your cleaning formulas. Hydrogen peroxide is an alternative to bleach, available at supermarkets and drugstores. Lemon juice is an excellent cleaner, available in both health food stores and supermarkets. Liquid Soaps are an alternative to harsher detergents and other cleaning agents, available in health food stores and supermarkets. Pumice Stone is a good for stain removing. Sodium Perborate is an alternative to standard bleaches made with sodium hypochlorite. It is also an alternative to standard bleaches, available from chemical supply companies.

Trisodium phosphate (TSP) is a powerful cleaning material. TSP can be irritating and caustic; it does not pose long term health hazards such as carcinogenicity, neurotoxicity, or reproductive effects. Be aware that some products with the name TSP on their container do not actually contain Trisodium phosphate. Available at supermarkets, drugstores, and hardware stores. Washing Soda (also known as sodium carbonate, soda ash, and sal soda) is a strong cleaner, as an alternative to the chemical cleaners. Zeolite is a naturally occurring mineral which is an excellent deodorizer and available from G&W Supply, 1441, W. 46th Avenue #31, Denver, Colorado 80211, ph. (303) 4558834. For more information you can contact, Cancer Prevention Coalition c/o School of Public Health University of Illinois Medical Center, 2121 East Taylor Street, Chicago, IL 60612, Tel. (312) 9962297, Fax (312) 9961374. Email epstein@uic.edu.

************************************************************************
SICK BUILDING SYNDROME (SDS) MAY CONTRIBUTE TO CANCER

Cancer doesn’t occur the next day. It takes decades to fester and blossom as a full blown cancer in a human body. Working in buildings with “Sick Building Syndrome” can contribute to cancer. Sources of indoor toxic pollution include volatile organic compounds released from particle board, plasticized furniture, carpets, glues, paints, office machine toners, and air fresheners. All contribute to a complex mixture of very low level of individual
pollutants, states Dr. Michael Hodgson, M.D., M.P.H., of the School of Medicine, University of Connecticut Health Centre in Farmington, Connecticut. Dr. Hodgson reports that the carcinogenic effects of certain indoor air pollutants, such as asbestos, environmental tobacco smoke, radon and formaldehyde, are well described in the clinical literature and are now considered cancer risk factors. Source, “Definitive Guide to Cancer” a source book written by W. John Diamond, M.D. and W. Lee Cowden, M.D. and Burton Goldberg, published by Future Medicine Publishing, Inc., Tiburon, California, 1997, see its website at http://www.alternativemedicine.com/index1.shtml

**************************************************************

ONE IN TWO MEN TO GET CANCER, ONE IN THREE WOMEN

In 1999, one in two American men and one in three American women will get cancer. In the 1950s, one in four Americans were afflicted with this deadly disease. Despite the expenditure of $25 billion since the war on cancer was declared by President Nixon in 1971, cancer rates have soared. Why? In a recently released book, Dr. Samuel Epstein reveals evidence implicating industrial carcinogens that permeate our environment, in our foods, our air, our water, our consumer products. And he blames the National Cancer Institute (NCI) and the American Cancer Society (ACS), what he calls “the cancer establishment,” for ignoring these causes and instead spending billions on the elusive search for a magic bullet cure for cancer. Source, “The Politics of Cancer Revisited” by Dr. Samuel Epstein East Ridge Press, Fremont Center, New York, 1998. Copies can be obtained through Dr. Epstein’s web site at http://www.preventcancer.com, or from the publisher by calling 18002692921).

Dr. Samuel Epstein points out, from 1950 to 1998, the overall incidence of cancer rose about 60 percent, with much higher increases for cancer of some organs. For non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma and multiple myeloma, the increase has been 200 percent. Breast cancers have increased by 60 percent. Prostate cancer has increased 200 percent. For testicular cancer in men of the ages 28 to 35, there has been a 300 percent increase since 1950. And don’t let anybody fool you into thinking that the cancer rate increase is because the population is getting older these rates are age adjusted. The cancer rates of a group of 50 year old men in 1990, for example, are compared to the cancer rates of a group of men in 1950. Dr. Epstein asks, “why is the cancer establishment losing the war against cancer? “The cancer establishment is fixated on damage control, diagnosis, treatment and basic genetic research, and is indifferent, if not sometimes hostile, to cancer prevention, in other words, getting carcinogens out of the environment.

**************************************************************

ENVIRONMENTALLY RELATED CANCER ON THE INCREASE IN ONTARIO
Many cancers in Ontario are on the rise, according to a new report, "Everyday Carcinogens, Stopping Cancer Before It Starts," by Liz Armstrong, for the Canadian Breast Cancer Prevention Coalition, released March 26, 1999. The report was commissioned for a conference on cancer prevention in Hamilton, Ontario. According to the report, in Ontario there has been a 29% increase in breast cancer, a 106% increase in Non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma, a 349% increase in women’s lung cancer, a 116% increase in melanoma and a 146% increase in thyroid cancer for women in the past 30 years. For men, there has been a 102% increase in prostate cancer, a 273% increase in melanoma, a 115% increase in Non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma, a 65% increase in testicular cancer, and a 133% increase in thyroid cancer.

"The problem is that these people are suffering from this disease, and often dying, unnecessarily," noted Dr. Sam Epstein, perhaps the world's most influential critic of cancer policy and the author of the book, The Politics of Cancer Revisited. "In Ontario, the focus is still on finding the cure rather than preventing this epidemic." Dr. Epstein, a Professor of Occupational Health and Environmental Medicine at the University of Illinois School of Public Health, stated that a significant number of cancers are attributable to environmental and workplace carcinogens and are therefore preventable. "Few Canadians in Ontario know that there has been an increase in many cancers that are linked to environmental and workplace causes. Moreover, cancer is a leading cause of death and is placing a huge strain on the health care system," according to, author of the report. You can call Liz Armstrong, Breast Cancer Prevention Coalition ph. (519) 833.7202. See the Canadian Environmental Law Association's (CELA) website at <http://www.web.net/cela/mr990326.htm>

ENVIRONMENT CAUSES OF CANCER PREDICTED IN 1964

In 1964, two senior scientists at the National Cancer Institute, Wilhelm Hueper and W.C. Conway, wrote, "Cancers of all types and all causes display even under already existing conditions, all the characteristics of an epidemic in slow motion." The unfolding epidemic was being fueled, they said in 1964, by "increasing contamination of the human environment with chemical and physical carcinogens and with chemicals supporting and potentiating their action."[1, pg. 43] Their words were met with silence.

The World Health Organization (WHO) maintains and analyzes cancer mortality (death) data from 70 countries. WHO research shows that industrialized countries have far more cancers than countries with little industry (after adjusting for age and population size). One-half of all the world’s cancers occur among people living in industrialized countries, even though such people are only one-fifth of the world’s population.[1, pg. 59] From these data, WHO has concluded that at least 80 percent of all cancer is attributable to environmental influences.[1, pg. 60]
In the U.S., the cancer epidemic described by Hueper and Conway in 1964 has been progressing steadily. In 1950, 25 percent of adults in the U.S. could expect to get cancer during their lifetimes. Today about 40 percent of North Americans (38.3% of women, 48.2% of men) can expect to get cancer. Omitting lung cancer from the statistics, the incidence (occurrence) of cancer increased 35% in the U.S. between 1950 and 1991. If we include lung cancers, then cancer incidence increased 49.3% between 1950 and 1991.[1, pg. 40]. Source, Rachel Newsletter, P.O. Box 5036, Annapolis, MD 21403, Fax (410) 263 8944; email erf@rachel.clark.net. Website at http://www.monitor.net/rachel/

TWICE THE AMOUNT OF CANCER AS OUR GRAND PARENTS

Viewing the same phenomenon from another vantage point: white women born in the U.S. in the 1940s have experienced 30 percent more nonsmokingrelated cancers than did women of their grandmothers' generation (women born between 1888 and 1897). Among men, the differences are even sharper. White men born in the 1940s have more than twice as much nontobacco related cancer as their grandfathers did at the same age.[1, pg. 45] (Historic data are missing for nonwhites.) In the U.S. today, in the age group 35 to 64, cancer is the number one killer.

GET NEW BOOK ON CANCER AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Sandra Steingraber's new book, „Living Downstream, An Ecologist Looks as Cancer and the Environment‰, has been greeted with nearly total silence amongst the cancer establishment. Published by Addison Wesley, the book is a major publishing event. In hard back, it has 270 pages, including 77 pages of references in small type at the back. At age 38, the author is an accomplished researcher, writer and teacher with a Ph.D. in biology from University of Michigan who has obviously spent years preparing the manuscript, visiting special libraries, interviewing cancer researchers, and applying her scientific training to the diverse evidence linking cancer to environmental contamination. Source, Peter Montague, Editor, Environmental Research Foundation, P.O. Box 5036, Annapolis, Maryland 21403-7036, ph. 1-888-2RACHEL.

CHLORINATED DRINKING WATER

Our cities purify our sewage laden drinking water from lakes and rivers with chlorine to kill the bacteria. Our swimming pools are loaded with chlorine to accommodate the hundreds of people that swim in them.
Yet chlorine in our water may be a source of increased rates of cancer. For example, consuming chlorinated drinking water is associated with a 20 to 40% increase in the incidence of colon and rectal cancer, according to the results of a Norwegian study published in the International Journal of Epidemiology in 1992. Another study done by Harvard University and the Medical College of Wisconsin found that the consumption of chlorinated drinking water accounts for 15% of all rectal cancers and 9% of all bladder cancers in North America. That's an additional 6,500 cases of rectal cancer and 4,200 cases of bladder cancer each year. The study found that people drinking chlorinated water over long periods of time have a 38% increase in their chances of contracting rectal cancer and a 21% increase in the risk of contracting bladder cancer.

The dangers from inhaling chlorine can exceed those derived from drinking chlorinated water. The amount of chloroform, the most common trihalomethane in chlorinated water, inhaled or absorbed through the skin during a typical shower may be 6 times higher than that absorbed from chlorinated drinking water, states the International Health News. Source, Definitive Guide to Cancer, a source book written by W. John Diamond, M.D. and W. Lee Cowden, M.D. and Burton Goldberg, published by Future Medicine Publishing, Inc., Tiburon, California, 1997, see its website at http://www.alternativemedicine.com/index3.shtml
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