

WANTED—NEW METHODS

*Common Sense May
Succeed Where the
Microscope Fails
in Cancer Research*

by

H. W. LEE



FOR nearly thirty-eight years cancer-research workers have annually presented a report which may fairly be described as stereotyped. It has consisted of a candid admission of failure and a Micawber-like confidence that something will turn up in the near future.

Cancer is so appalling a scourge that relief from its menace would hardly be dearly purchased at the cost of all the wealth and treasure of the world, and every thinking person shrinks from writing or speaking a word likely to check the inflow of gifts to any group of qualified men devoting their time, energy and skill to discovering an effective method of combating it.

The time, however, has surely arrived when those who supply the funds should have some say in deciding the lines upon which research work shall be conducted. A feeling is rapidly growing that orthodoxy not only regards its consistently unsuccessful method of research as a fetish or delity which it were sacrilege to question, but also contemptuously refuses to consider the suggestions which many eminent medical men are convinced are of importance and likely to yield considerable success. It is, indeed, a fairly well-known fact that doctors, as well as nature-curers, have, for a number of years, used these suggested methods with remarkable results.

THE protests of medical men

and scientists—many of them world famous—relieve the laity of the necessity of looking to nature-curers for guidance in its attitude toward cancer research as it has been conducted in the past, and will be in the future, if matters are to be allowed to still drift. It is highly significant that cancer researchers are challenged by their medical confreres, and that the latter propose methods of investigation and practice which have long been advocated by men and women who believe that Nature ever points the way. It is surely reasonable that suggestions by such men as Sir William Arbuthnot Lane, Sir Bruce Bruce-Porter, Dr. Leonard Williams, Dr. Woods Hutchinson, Dr. Edward Bach and Dr. Alexander Barton (to mention but a few of famous doctors who favour the methods of treatment now employed by Dr. Ulric Williams in New Zealand) should carry at least equal weight as those of the medical

practitioners who at present direct cancer research work.

"LIGHT not yet seen," Professor Dodds declared at the Australian Cancer Conference in Sydney this year, and with unconscious humour a Christchurch doctor described the professor as the "highlight of the conference."

"More than four million pounds," Dr. J. E. R. Donagh, F.R.C.S., an eminent bacteriologist, reminds us, "have been wasted upon cancer research when the nature of the conditions should, at all times, have been obvious, and its prevention solely a matter of proper living."

Professor Hastings Gifford, F.R.C.S., in the "Medical Press," Sept. 26, 1926, wrote: "This gigantic effort was proved a complete failure."

AN endeavour to establish the cause of, and find a cure for, cancer has provided one of the most concentrated fields of scientific endeavour in the last two decades. There is, however, an influential, of unorthodox, school of scientific opinion which holds that it would be of far more practical value to mankind if the money spent on tracking the elusive cancer-organism were spent on educating people in rules of healthy living by observance of which the incidence of virtually all diseases, cancer included, could be minimised.

This article by Mr. H. W. Lee, well-known Christchurch pioneer of the Naturopath movement in New Zealand, expresses succinctly one view of the cancer problem.

He was particularly referring to the experiments on mice, rats, and other animals. In 1934 there were 50,022 experiments conducted in England and Wales alone on these unfortunate, tortured creatures. In "The Lancet," of October 25, 1930, the same gentleman said: "After a quarter of a century of research we can see to what a deplorable waste of energy, ability and money this academic, aimless toil may lead. One useful, if negative, induction, however, emerges—which is that the problem of the causation of human cancer is NOT to be

solved by experiments upon animals in laboratories."

THE claim that treatment by radium has proved a success is weakened rather than strengthened by the remarks of Dr. Cecil Rowntree at the annual meeting of the Royal Cancer Hospital in March of this year.

"Dramatic advances," he solemnly told his audience, had been made in the treatment of cancer by surgical operation and the use of X-rays. "Cancer on the face, lips and skin generally was being cured with a certainty, simplicity and safety never experienced previously." A similar statement was made last month by Dr. W. Gilmour in Auckland, who also appears to hold the sun's rays partly responsible for the causation of cancer: if there were anything in this theory every man who works on our roads or in the fields would fall a sure victim to... (Continued on page 45).