

Cancer Masons: A Cult of Death

by Tom Valentine

There is an absolute monopoly when it comes to the approved treatments for cancer in the United States, and also in much of the world. This monopoly has prevented better, more effective, more scientific and far more humane treatments from being accepted by the cancer establishment.

The truth is, millions have suffered at the hands of their orthodox physicians needlessly. Why? I say the devil made them do it. You are laughing, but hear me out. I say the cancer industry is absolute evil.

The reason I chose modern cancer research history to illustrate evil is because the examples are so very clear. To deliberately add to the misery of sick people, as the institutions have done during the past century, requires human operatives with a sense of evil beyond the mere self-serving desires lurking within us all.

I say this historic example requires a general aura of evil of a satanic nature that has continued down through time in an institutional form. This history of cancer research illustrates organized institutional evil that can only be a carry-over from the earliest times in man's history when these institutions were under the direct, unchecked influence and direction of Satan himself. I refer to this institutional evil as simply "Masonic."

I believe those who fancy themselves philosopher kings or adepts of Masonry tap into traditions of defying God that go all the way back to Nimrod, builder of the Tower of Babel. This is a cabal carrying on a tradition best described as a cult of death. The history of masonry, or organized evil is another subject dealt with elsewhere in this series.

Cancer is a hideous, insidious, invasive, and corrosive way to have one's body devoured from the inside out. As this is written in February of 2005, cancer is becoming the number one killer disease of modern America—replacing in statistical ranking heart and artery disease. Both forms of disease, by the way, have the same inherently evil dogmatic monopolistic history. The death and destruction from cancer has progressed in evil harmony with the amount of money society has managed to spend in making war against it. Cancer research and medicine is proof positive of the adage that if you toss more money and bureaucracy at a problem, you will absolutely get more of the problem.

In my high school years (1949-53) "everybody knew" that cancer was an incurable disease. This was a lie put forth by the cancer institutions that had already become a financial behemoth based upon emotional propaganda such as "fight cancer with a check-up and a check." This gimmick caused a vicious cycle. Getting a check-up by a physician found more cancer among the people, which enlarged cancer statistics, which were used to scare more people into getting checked up. It has never improved the cure rate, but it increased misery by having more people medicated, burned and cut in futility than ever before.

However, by the time I entered high school at the middle of the 20th century there had already been several proved modalities for keeping cancer in check, without writing a blank check. There have been many “alternative therapies” for treating cancer more humanely and sensibly than the cut, burn and poison techniques so dominant in the industry today. Note the word “industry” it will return. But I concentrate on two cases because they illustrate the point most effectively and clearly.

In the final decade of the 1800s a Scottish embryologist discovered the basis of what we now call “stem cells” and just before the turn of the century he had elucidated how cancer, in the form of trophoblast cells, which are involved in every pregnancy, served a useful purpose as the chorion envelope surrounding the early fetus. If the invasive cells of the chorion envelope are not wiped out after the 56th day of pregnancy, both the mother and new fetus will die of a horrible form of cancer—chorionepithelioma.

Beard learned through animal experiments that the key timing device in switching off this invasive, parasitic envelope, which gives every new embryo its start, was the development of a pancreas gland in the fetus.

Nature’s solution to this deadly cancer that gives life in the earliest stages, is a digestive enzyme produced by the pancreas—trypsin. To make a long story about years of research and development short, Dr. John Beard, professor at Edinburgh University determined prior to the dawn of the 20th century that this enzyme was capable of devouring and removing cancer cells and tumors. Beard first published his findings in 1902 in the prestigious journal *Lancet*.

Beard was a careful and exacting scientist. Flush with his discoveries about enzymes, which were known to biological scientists at that time but were not attracting any attention outside of digestion, Beard injected extract of trypsin in mice with Jenson’s sarcoma, and the tumors regressed. This was an extraordinary achievement and should have changed the direction of cancer research and medicine at the time.

In fact, other physicians and researchers adopted Beard’s magnificent enzyme discovery, and for the next 20 years they published in the top journals, *Lancet* and *British Medical Journal*, how successful the enzyme treatments had been on human patients.

Godfearing men with good intentions would have joyously set out to verify and utilize this non-toxic, non-invasive treatment for a dread disease. However, the powerful men of the “Crown” running the institutions of Europe and America refused to abandon dogma and viciously attacked Beard and all who spoke well of his work.

Beard fought back valiantly, publishing a monograph in 1911 titled *The Enzyme Treatment of Cancer*, which presented his case impressively. It is said that the “truth will out.” And, surely it did in this case—but the establishment monopoly obviously did not want the truth. John Beard died in 1924 a bitter and lonely genius.

Evidently the devil loves cruel irony, because the year after Beard published his monograph (1912) the world suddenly learned about Marie Curie and her discovery of the rays emitted by radium. The establishment, directed by those who control the credit required for the financial development of new ideas, leaped aboard the radiation train.

Whereas the media of the day had only ridiculed Beard's work, it heralded Madame Curie and radiation. It didn't take long for burning tumors with irradiation to join surgery and dangerous drugs as a popular, but hardly successful, therapy for cancer. The wonderful non-toxic use of trypsin and other enzymes dropped down Orwell's memory hole. The deliberateness of the suppression is what makes this evil. The powers of the dogmatic establishment displayed an evil arrogance by unfairly and dishonestly destroying Beard's enzyme treatment. This same evil arrogance has destroyed many viable cancer alternatives over the past two centuries.

Now we must pause to analyze a significant change in the history of cancer research and therapy. Surgery, chemotherapy and radiation, the cut, poison and burn methods for "attacking" cancer rather than treating it, were officially and firmly established by the time John Beard died in 1924. In the United States the medical monopoly of the union doctors—American Medical Association— had been established with state licensing procedures and medical training schools utterly in their power. At about the same time the Federal Food and Drug Agency (FDA) was formed and transformed. It was formed as a reasonable idea for protecting consumers, but it was quickly transformed into a monopoly protection agency. One can read all about it in the book written by the first FDA director, Harvey Wiley MD. The book is titled: *The History of a Crime; How Could it Happen*.

Without exception in my reading of the history of mankind, whenever a good idea becomes institutionalized the good idea takes a back seat and the maintenance and promotion of the institution becomes the reason for existence. Institutionalized "health care" is a classic example of a burial ground for good ideas. In fact by calling it "health care" we are partaking of the Orwellian concept of newspeak. Institutionalized medicine is all about reaping benefit from sickness costs and virtually nothing about true health.

The first rule of institutionalization is to become dogmatic and protect your turf at all costs. Few institutions demonstrate this better than the modern medical cabal involving medicine, pharmacy, insurance and government. What this monopoly has truly done, regardless of those cases where genuine cures occurred, is kill more people in more miserable ways (dying of cancer is a horror) than any other do-good institution yet created.

Why would anyone be devoted to the darkness of evil in a Creation that begins with light? To me, the only answer that withstands all the challenges of reason, logic, time, human psychology and history is the story of the fall of man presented in Scripture.

Many people believe the devil does not exist. Many may believe mention of Satan and Lucifer in the Bible is mere metaphor describing the evil side of man's nature. I

disagree, but I can't prove anything; I can only suggest. Personally, I have no doubts about Satan/Lucifer being a real entity rather than a metaphor.

The angel of light became the messenger of darkness, and I also believe that the influence of this powerful entity on man's behavior was without checks and balances until the advent of Christ. After Christ established His kingdom (a spiritual realm for those who heard and obeyed) following the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD, the devil was limited in his ability to directly influence human behavior. Prior to the advent of Christ, Satan could actively participate with man, and form organizations to promulgate his opposition to God. I believe these organizations still exist and still do the devil's work based upon traditions established. Christ spoke firmly against the traditions of men making the word of God of non-effect. Thus, the title of this paper: Cancer Masons.

Doing evil in the name of good is the essence of diabolical, a word meaning "of the devil." I heard a pulpit-pounding preacher of the old school give his version of the devil. It is the best explanation of why everything coming out of man's institutions can become exactly the opposite of what is good for humanity. In a nutshell, here's that sermon:

According to Scripture it is clear that the devil wants to be God. It is also clear that he is not God and cannot be God, so how in the hell is he going to fool people into thinking he is God? He uses the mirror trick. When we look into a mirror we see ourselves, exactly as we are, down to the pimples and warts. And yet, what we see is exactly the opposite of reality. Our left eye is our right eye; left ear, right ear and so forth. Our reflection comes back to us on the opposite side of reality.

Satan "mirrors" God. Where God uplifts and creates, Satan tears down and destroys. This is why so many things are exactly the opposite of what should be. Cancer research should seek cures and comfort for people in desperate condition, but the institution filters out sane, workable discoveries for no logical reason—as happened with Beard's use of enzymes—and conversely promotes insane, destructive procedures of the cut, burn and poison variety knowing full well they do not work. The directors of this monopoly cannot pretend ignorance of the viable alternatives they have deliberately quashed in their support of dogma. And, if they did not act in ignorance, the only explanation for their actions is—evil.

Dr. Nicholas Gonzalez of New York has been carrying the banner for Dr. Beard's enzyme therapy in recent years and has written fine articles about Beard's magnificent work a century ago. In a recent article, Dr. Gonzales wrote about the establishment's destruction of Beard's work as follows:

"I have often pondered the vitriolic—and irrational—response of so many eminent researchers and scientists to Beard's well-documented approach, reactions that nearly buried the treatment for keeps. He was trained impeccably as a scientist and behaved throughout his life as a true researcher, carefully documenting his laboratory and clinical results in the mainstream medical literature. But, it made no difference at all.

“The rejection of enzyme therapy 100 years ago had really nothing to do with science but everything to do with politics, psychology and popularity...”

Dr. Gonzalez goes on to rationalize the evil that occurred, and I repeat it here. Note, however, that the writer does not necessarily believe nor see the institutional evil, which is the subject of this paper. His rationale is perhaps “acceptable” to many modern Americans. It is unacceptable to me.

“...Beard was a nerdy ivory tower scientist, who had little patience for his critics whom he saw as unacceptably ignorant. He didn’t court the press, didn’t care about fame, and didn’t seem at all interested in international acclaim. His refusal to play the political game properly, his refusal to court his colleagues and media of the day, I believe worked against him. I also think that his approach was just too simple, perhaps not mysterious enough to enchant his fellow researchers.”

That simply doesn’t wash. Obviously the callers of the shots at the Royal Society and among the institutions of the Crown in England, Europe and the US were not eagerly seeking a simple, clean, elegant solution to cancer, or else they would have leaped into the fray to prove the benefits they were hearing about. It is true that playing the proper politics has a role within institutionalized thinking and doing, but we read how many other researchers verified Dr. Beard’s therapy—were all of them reclusive nerds?

One also wonders where the eager and active journalists were. Surely they, like me, would have been excited to hear about such an elegant therapy. I’m betting some writers did want to ballyhoo the story in spite of Beard’s alleged recalcitrance but they ran into an editor’s spike. Nothing is new under the sun, what happened to me surely happened to others.

As a reporter for a major newspaper, I personally wanted to tell the stories of viable cancer treatment alternatives, but powerful editors killed the idea and steered me away. The one exception took place in 1966 at the small Santa Maria Times in California where I told the story of John Beard’s enzymes and other alternatives in a series on the front pages four days running.

That series, incidentally, caused the American Cancer Society to sponsor a meeting for doctors in that town, and they called the Times publisher on the carpet for allowing the series. The criticism of the series amounted to nothing of substance, because Beard’s work is substantial. The artfully arrogant criticism was—“Tom Valentine is a sports writer who thinks he’s a doctor.”

Wasn’t that scientific?

The story of John Beard might not make a case for institutional evil all by itself, but there are many such stories—the literature is rich in concrete examples. I will comment only on one more, but there are many books written about how the cancer establishment has unfairly and unscientifically destroyed alternatives that may have profoundly affected

their monopoly. “The Cancer Industry,” by Dr. Ralph Moss is a good example. “The Burzynski Breakthrough” by Thomas Elias is a recent tale of the same old institutionalized evil.

At one time I thought seriously about writing a biography of Dr. William F. Koch, a scientist and physician without peer in the cancer research world of 1919 through the 1950s.

Dr. Koch died in exile because the cancer establishment drove him from his native United States. A detailed account of his cancer work is found in a 1968 book, *Cancer Cures Crucified*, written by Suzanne Caum. She had been a terminal cancer patient who became one of [Koch](#)'s many successful cancer cures. It was self-published because no publisher dared touch it. You may find many references to Dr. Koch's remarkable work on the Internet.

Dr. Koch's ability as a biochemist thrust his thinking decades ahead of his time and the seemingly simple cellular oxidation metabolism therapy, called glyoxylide, he invented was, perhaps, too biochemically advanced for the establishment cranks to understand—yet the facts indicate some of them knew full well he was onto something remarkable. Morris Fishbein, the infamous director of the AMA for decades, knew the value of Koch's discovery—he tried to tie it up, but failed and turned viciously against Koch. The destruction of Koch's reputation and the ruination of his life in America were far too vitriolic and intentional to be mere objection to alleged quackery. Methinks the establishment complained too much.

When the institutionalized evil destroyed Dr. Koch, they set molecular biology back by at least half a century. Koch was that far ahead of his peers in understanding free radical, oxidation-reduction molecular biochemistry.

In *The Cancer Industry*, Dr. Moss illustrates how the establishment has managed to destroy innovation over and over again without adequately or fairly investigating it or testing it. The American Cancer Society's list of “unorthodox treatments” has an impressive lineup of ingenious researchers—who were never eagerly nor hopefully investigated. Ironically, Moss tells of one member of the cancer establishment who admitted to him that new ideas for research in our time springs from the denigrated “quacks” of the past.

Dr. Moss lists 63 “unproven methods of cancer treatment” and shows the amount of research the establishment used to allege that they were unacceptable to the monopoly. Many ingenious physicians and researchers were tossed unceremoniously and viciously onto the quack heap just to keep the monopoly safe.

In 1972, President Richard Nixon focused the vast power of the United States government against cancer by declaring “war” on it. More than three decades later and with more than \$30 billion taxpayer dollars spent, after adjusting for longer life span, the incidence of cancer continues to go up. The cancer incidence, for example, rose about

44% between 1950 and 1989. The AMA Journal (pretending to be on the side of truth, honesty, health and public service) published an article in 2004 titled: “Are Increasing Five-Year Survival Rates Evidence of Success Against Cancer?” The answer was a resounding “no.”

Cancer has been with mankind from the beginning. The cancer institutions have only been with us less than two centuries. I say it is a death cult operation. That is the only explanation that truly makes sense. I agree that individuals can be quite evil, destructive and vindictive, but the unreasonably suppressive history of the cancer institutions illustrates that a force like the “hidden hand” of Adam Smith’s capitalism manages to arrange individual shortcomings to work together in a concert of evil. There is a powerful cabal controlling all the world’s finances, whose members are devoted to the wretched philosophies one can find under the umbrella of masonry. I say they use their power and influence to maintain this destructive monopoly of medicine that kills in the name of healing and public service—the mirror image