

The Good Fight

Health Sciences Institute e-Alert

July 1, 2004

Dear Reader,

If you search the Internet using the words "cancer" and "sugar," one person's name will come up again and again: Otto Warburg, Ph.D.

More than 70 years ago, Dr. Warburg won the Nobel Prize in medicine when he discovered that cancer cells require glucose (sugar) for growth. All cells have a requirement for glucose, but cancer cells consume as much as 4 to 5 times more glucose than normal, healthy cells. In fact, they're unable to multiply rapidly without it.

It's simply astonishing to me that this simple knowledge hasn't become the basis for Rule One in any cancer fight: Stop eating sugar immediately.

Sugar, minus nutrients

I asked HSI Panelist Allan Spreen, M.D., if he could shed some light on the association of sugar and cancer, and here's what he had to say:

"Nutritionally oriented doctors have known about the refined sugar/cancer association for decades. Dr. Warburg was about as brilliant as they come, right up there with Hans Nieper, M.D., Linus Pauling, Ph.D., and possibly even the incomparable Nikola Tesla (no doctorate...just plain super-humanly brilliant). His medical insight was amazing.

"It's pretty easy to figure that the cells that are dividing

(multiplying) the fastest have the highest requirement for energy (to sustain such accelerated growth). Cutting out the source is similar to cutting off the blood supply - though not quite as drastic, it's certainly a step worth taking.

"Another issue is the fact that refined sugars are not nutrient-dense...they contain none of the nutrients necessary for the assimilation of the sugar ingested. Therefore, the body must drain body stores (if any are present) to handle the job, leaving less (or none) for other tasks. This is why chewing on natural sugar cane is not the problem - it's eating the pure, concentrated, naked-calorie refined sugar after processing out the water, fiber (which slows the sugar assimilation), and nutrients.

"Obviously giving up sugar isn't the cure for cancer. But I'd recommend the tactic **STRONGLY** to anyone with cancer (or, actually, any other illness)."

Substitutes help the cause

Because I've addressed sugar substitutes in previous e-Alerts (most recently in "The Sweet Lowdown" 6/3/04), I wondered if one of these alternate sweeteners (such as stevia or xylitol) might also feed the cancer cells in the same way sugar does.

Dr. Spreen said, "Stevia won't, because it's zero-calorie. Xylitol could be more of a quandary. It does contain calories (about 40% less than sugar), and it's labeled a 'sugar-alcohol.' Apparently that status causes a slower release into the body and less absorption, giving it a lower glycemic index. For that reason it would be less of a problem as it isn't so strong a refined carbohydrate. How much less would be controversial, since the sugar/cancer cell growth issue itself is a tough one."

Keep in mind that the body also breaks down carbohydrates into glucose, so a diet that's heavy with high carbohydrate foods can also fuel cancer cell growth as well as other health problems that are known to be linked to excess blood glucose, including: obesity, diabetes, heart disease, an overgrowth of pathogenic intestinal flora, gout, panic attacks, hyperactivity, and depression.

Every little bit helps

Most doctors are not nutritionists, so they're either unaware of the link between sugar and cancer, or they simply neglect to mention it to their patients. If someone you care about is fighting cancer, don't assume they've heard about this important nutritional detail. As always, we encourage you to share this information with anyone you know that might benefit from it.

For anyone who's fighting cancer, there's obviously only one way to go concerning refined sugar. To fight the good fight