

## Politics and Science: Suppression of Cancer Treatment

Hello, and welcome to Politics and Science. I am your host, John Barkhausen. Today we feature an archive of my interview of Dr. Raymond Peat, PhD, recorded at WGDR, circa 2001. In this show he discusses the remarkable story of Dr. Stefan Durovic and his cancer treatment known as krebiozen. He also covers the heroic, but ultimately fruitless, efforts of Dr. Andrew C. Ivy who was at the time one of America's most prominent scientists. Dr. Ivy attempted to give this promising treatment the clinical testing that its positive findings warranted. In case you are interested in this subject, the meticulously written book that tells the story in detail is by Herbert Smith Bailey and is called *K: Krebiozen, cure to cancer* – that is spelled out at the end of the show.

In this show, Dr. Peat also discusses the suppressed work of of an earlier brilliant cancer researcher called Dr. William F. Koch, MD, PhD and his successful cancer treatments. If you are interested in Dr. Raymond Peat's work, many of his writings are available at his website: [raypeat.com](http://raypeat.com)

And now, once again, here is Dr. Raymond Peat:

RP: ...**Andrew C. Ivy**, these people overlap for various reasons, partly because alternative health, particularly alternative cancer people were working on essentially the same ideas, and they were all attacked by the established forces that were working on different assumptions.

JB: What year was this?

RP: Oh, Koch started his work, I think one of his publications was 1911, another 1914, and by the 20's he had a clinic going in Cleveland. He was a professor of medicine and chemistry and he was the first person to take seriously for biochemistry the work on free radicals of **Moses Gomberg**, who demonstrated that free radicals really exist – they aren't just a hypothesis that exists only on paper. But Moses Gomberg showed that highly colored chemicals are pure when you can get free radicals to separate in solution, and the color is because the electron that is no longer paired is free enough that it absorbs light in the visible spectrum, and so that's one of the simple ways to test an unpaired electron is that suddenly the solution goes dark. Even chemists didn't take Gomberg seriously. In Russia, he was a major influence, but in the United States, for probably 40 or 50 years, free radical chemistry just couldn't take off. The industrial chemist, I think it was DuPont himself, maybe not, but anyway, it was the head of one of the early plastics companies told William Koch that he had better be quiet about the idea of applying free radical chemistry in medicine, because people didn't even understand that in organic, ordinary chemistry, and they were going to say that the was talking about fantasies if he talked about the free radical basis of biology.

It was around 1950 that the instrumentation became available to demonstrate that free radicals really did exist in living tissue. And what was the name of the scientist who ran for President in – I think it was the Peace and Freedom Party – in the 1970's? **Barry Commoner**. He was one of the first people to demonstrate free radicals existing in living tissues.

JB: I didn't know that. When did the free radical theory start?

RP: Well, about 1905, I think. 1900-1905 was when Moses Gomberg was demonstrating them, but immediately Koch was putting it into theoretical thinking about what cells were doing. And he applied it to the concept of polymerization and blood clotting as his first thing. And he knew that in healing a wound or a cancer, blood clotting is one of the first things that happens. And the clotting abnormalities

are characteristic of cancer. And it turned out that for places like DuPont, the polymerization was in fact a very important practical industrial principle using the free radical. But Koch anticipated even industrial thinking within just a few years of starting to work on it. He was applying it theoretically and practically to devise both explanations for disease and therapies.

JB: He seems like quite a brilliant man.

RP: Yeah, so quick to apply knowledge that was very clear and definite, but other people couldn't accept it because it just didn't seem to fit the low standard that was common in chemistry and all branches of science and biology at that time.

JB: The free radical – I'm sorry, I'm pretty ignorant here, but – the free radical theory – that must have come out of the atomic theory of electrons?

RP: Yeah, ordinary chemistry on paper, they would show an atom coming loose, or an atom with other atoms attached to it, coming lose from another group and taking one electron away from where each atom had been contributing an electron to a pair that made a stable compound. On paper, they could take away a group with one electron and allow it to combine somewhere else, but they just couldn't believe that could really exist in a watery solution for example. But Moses Gomberg did – it was with triphenylethane – anyway, it had three large carbon rings, attached to one tiny molecule in the center, and the tendency of the benzene ring to repel because they were placed too close together, and the whole group wasn't very soluble in water. The force of the water and the closeness of these large groups – if you diluted, if you kept adding water to a solution of this compound, as it got very highly dilute, the color would suddenly change from clear to a deep purple. As you got it diluted enough, the groups would be able to fall apart from each other and exist freely in solution.

Anyone who knew homeopathy, which a well-educated doctor did in 1900, knew that the principle of homeopathy was that some compounds become chemically more reactive when they are highly diluted. And so it was natural for someone with a medical education to see the importance of this chemical principle, but not many people who had studied homeopathy as well as classical medicine had also studied chemistry, which **Koch** did.

The first time I heard about Koch was I think 1933 or 1934. People were circulating little mimeograph newsletters about the scandal of how he was being persecuted by the FBI and so on. And the history of his two trials – It had been written up and Koch himself told some of the stories, and these stories have never been refuted, they are pretty well-documented – he said that criminals who tried to kill him later were proven to be, at that time, agents of the FBI. And the public didn't start hearing of mob FBI connections or CIA connections until the Church Committee in the 70's brought out the stuff that it was something that had been going on for a long time.

JB: Was that pre-Hoover?

RP: Oh no. Yeah, Hoover was there for about 50 years.

JB: Yeah, he was quite a ganster. So, and why were they going after him at that point?

RP: Well, his clinic was so successful in Cleveland that it was bringing a lot of attention to him even though he followed DuPont's advice and – maybe it wasn't DuPont – but anyway, he followed this industrialist's advice and didn't explain the free radical basis – he was just having objective results that

brought a lot of attention to his clinic. He had tried to publish all of the details in the period of 1917-1921. He submitted papers all over the world, but the standard medical journals wouldn't accept a free radical chemical explanation for any biological event. And so the government then was claiming that he had a secret method, simply because he couldn't get journals to publish it – they called it a “secret quack method” – but years later after I had studied Koch's books thoroughly, and I had also been studying **Otto Warburg's** work and **Albert Szent-Gyorgyi's** work on cancer, and I noticed dramatic parallels between the work Szent-Gyorgyi was doing all the way through from the 30's when he got the Nobel Prize, all the way down to I think it was about 1973 or 4. When I wrote to Szent-Gyorgyi, I outlined over about two pages, the amazing similarities between Koch's work that he had described in his books, done between 1910 and 1925 or so, and what Szent-Gyorgyi started doing in about 1932 and continued to the 1970's. I outlined this amazing set of parallels and said, “Is this just coincidence, or were you influenced by W. F. Koch?” Because in all of Szent-Gyorgyi's work I couldn't find a single reference to W. F. Koch. And he answered that he had the highest respect for the work of W. F. Koch, which obviously meant that since he had never referred to it in print, that he knew what had happened to Koch and didn't want it to happen to him.

JB: Maybe we can go back a little bit and talk about Koch's cancer therapy and how he was persecuted. Who was he threatening at the time?

RP: I think it was the FDA itself that accused him of violating the law by selling something that they said couldn't cure cancer. So they had it analyzed and couldn't detect anything in it, but –

JB: They had his cure analyzed?

RP: Yeah, and they said it was distilled water. And he made some in accord, according to his procedure. He took this highly colored material and diluted it, and it was so dilute that it looked like distilled water, and he gave some of the sample and had them analyze it, and they said, “It is distilled water.” And so the jury could see that their own eyes had seen stuff go into it and the government was telling them it wasn't there. And so twice he was acquitted. But he decided it was time to get out of the country with people trying to kill him and keeping him constantly in court instead of doing science. And so he spent the rest of his life after 1944 in Brazil.

JB: Are any remnants of his work still operating in Brazil?

RP: I guess about 15 years ago, I talked to a very old man who had worked with him. I don't think there's probably anyone still living who is directly connected with him. Koch died I think about 1968.

JB: What was the distilled water solution... was it homeopathy?

These people who worked with him said it was done by judgment. He used a red-hot platinum electrode and passed alcohol vapors, not an electrode, but a reactor, that was heated electrically to just the right color of red, and passed a stream of alcohol vapor over that and at that temperature, the alcohol polymerized into a water-soluble chain of molecules, which were unstable enough that they would release the individual either carbon, oxygen, hydrogen group, or a small chain of those carbon-oxygen groups into solution. And that was his primary reagent. He also used benzoquinone at high dilution but that was just an easy to make lower-potency thing. His primary reagent was the thing which required the judgment of knowing just how red your platinum reactor had to be. So the people who had seen him do it, could repeat it, and there were people in Brazil, might still be there, I suppose there are labs that have passed the technique along. I haven't heard from them for years, though.

JB: How did this affect, um, how was this an anti-cancer therapy?

RP: Well, one of his early publications had to do with the muscle spasms that typically follow removal of the thyroid gland. The parathyroids tend to be removed along with the thyroid if the surgeon doesn't make a special effort. Even though that was used as the explanation for why thyroid surgery causes these muscle spasms, even the most careful surgeon, who takes out the thyroid, even when he leaves the parathyroids, it is typical for the patient to suffer from these spasms. Anyway, Koch experimented with the removal of just the parathyroid glands and found that if you give any salt electrolyte, such as potassium, sodium, magnesium, or calcium, if you give it generously, you prevent the spasms.

He was arguing that the parathyroid gland was involved in detoxifying compounds that derived from ammonia – guanidine and methyl-guanidine, and that these chemicals are poisonous and known to cause seizures and muscle spasms. And he could demonstrate that he was causing these to be passed off in the urine by increasing the salt intake. And that was published I think 1917. But then **A. J. Carlson**, a very powerful professor at the University of Chicago and his group, decided that one hormone has only one action, and they basically proclaimed that the parathyroid hormone has the action of mobilizing calcium, and that in a calcium deficiency, you get the spasms.

But there are just terrible problems with that – the whole setup – because their description of what is happening to calcium turned out to be without foundation. It was all a hypothetical theory that attempted to describe this hormone in terms of one singular action on calcium, and that one turns out not to be the way they thought it was, and still no one has reverted to consider Koch's explanation.

But anyway, Koch explained the toxicity of these compounds as – they are similar to what ammonia does – but the amino or ammonia group occurs in many chemicals that produce seizures and spasms and over-stimulation. We now call it excitotoxicity. And ammonia and serotonin – just a tremendous range of amino compounds – have this action. And the carbonyl group that was the essence of Koch's treatment, whether the carbonyl was in his polymer that he made on his platinum reactor, or whether it was the carbonyl that was part of the benzoquinone molecule, it was this which Koch explained as drawing electrons to itself, away from the electron donors of the ammonia compounds. And during this time, not only was free radical chemistry an underground current, but the acid theory of **Gilbert Lewis** – this was happening at the same time – Lewis was a professor and chemist – I think his theory came out in 1914 and it was a general theory of acidity and alkalinity in terms of electron withdrawal or donation, and it was exactly compatible with Koch's oxidation-reduction explanation of how his catalyst worked.

Again, the Lewis theory, which was totally general, as a description of acids and bases, couldn't take on people brought out the **Bronsted-Lowry** theory of acids, which is what everyone now teaches – that acid is a hydrogen ion donor. pH is a description of the concentration of hydrogen ions. And even though it is not a general theory, because there are acids which contain no protons, no hydrogen ions, this is the standard theory of acids and basis. So Lewis' theory of acidity which was true and general, was displaced by a basically erroneous theory, which is now everyone's chemical textbook description of what an acid is.

JB: They're still saying it today.

RP: And totally ignoring the implications of Gilbert Lewis' good theory, and especially the implications it has for biology and medicine and biochemistry. Szent-Gyorgyi was essentially looking for evidence

of Koch's high-energy promotor of oxidation as an electron acceptor in physiology. Koch had postulated that benzoquinone was useful because there was a quinone molecule in the cell, that this was a close imitation of, and would therefore activate. And it wasn't until 1950 or so that it was discovered that there in fact is an essential oxidizing quinone in the cell – in the mitochondrion – and it is so ubiquitous that it is called ubiquinone. And at the time, Koch was saying this, analytical chemistry wasn't refined to the point that it could go beyond his theory which had therapeutic results, and so they said that it couldn't have therapeutic results because it isn't there. But Szent-Gyorgyi appreciated the logic, and so he was working on the respiratory chemistry and in the process accidentally discovered things like big parts of the Krebs Cycle, of the mitochondria, and ascorbic acid and so on, but this was really in the process of working on respiration itself.

JB: Is this what he received the Nobel Prize for?

RP: Yes, for his discoveries that led to the Krebs cycle, and ascorbic acid, and so on, respiration and muscle studies, too. The muscle action was another one of Krebs things – you know the methyl-guanidine causing muscle contraction by donating electrons to a system that should have the electrons withdrawn by the oxidative catalyst. And this became clearer and clearer in Szent-Gyorgyi's work why he was working both on muscle contraction and oxidative metabolism – at the time, it seemed like he was working on two separate lines, but Koch is the explanation of Szent-Gyorgyi's whole career, basically. He later became explicit in showing why the donation of electrons to muscles causes them to contract, and another theory besides the proton theory of acids, another theory that just becomes an obstacle to understanding is the membrane theory of cell function, which explains cell electricity in terms of ions and protons. Szent-Gyorgyi was working on the direct involvement of electrons and respiration as the primary thing that regulates those electrons. And in consciousness for example, consciousness disappears instantly when oxygen is no longer available to accept electrons, before there is any detectable change in the cellular energy level.

Szent-Gyorgyi was focusing on these things that really work, really explain cell physiology, and basically ignoring the silliness about protons and cell membranes and so on. And one of Szent-Gyorgyi's experiments involved adding electron donor chemicals and electron acceptor chemicals to a living muscle, and if the donor and acceptor were related to each other in terms of their oxidation potential, the muscle would contract in their presence. But if these two groups were not tuned to each other, the muscle wouldn't react. And this was about as close as you can imagine coming to verifying what Koch was saying about the electron acceptor and donor donating an electron to a muscle system or any cellular system causes it to go into the active state and the high-energy oxidant causes it to stabilize and go into a resting state. For all of these people, Warburg, Koch, and Szent-Gyorgyi, cancer, allergy, muscle spasms and seizures were all examples of the activated state in which there were excess electrons. Oxidation was the basic answer to restoring the cell to its stable resting state. This puts the cancer problem in a different evolutionary light. These people were seeing cell division as the basic state of any cell. That at a point in evolution, oxidative respiration came in, and made it possible for cells to stop dividing long enough to form part of a functioning multi-cellular organism. And so the reversion to cancer became simply interference with the ability to respire on the cellular level.

JB: So the problem with cancer and spasms and seizures is just that your cells are just not getting the oxygen?

RP: Or can't use it. Warburg's definition of cancer metabolically was that it is aerobic glycolysis – ordinarily glycolysis is a process similar to fermentation in which sugar is used very wastefully – and it happens in the absence of oxygen, because oxygen metabolism is very efficient and glycolysis happens

normally happens only when there is no oxygen because it is so inefficient. When you block the oxygen apparatus or the supply, you get intense glycolysis, and so if it is the apparatus, rather than the supply which is blocked, this is what happens in disease. And so this is aerobic glycolysis vs. anaerobic – anaerobic is the normal glycolysis. Aerobic glycolysis is evidence that the respiring organ isn't working right.

JB: So all these people were on a different track of looking for causes of disease and cancer. Why do you think they were so shunned by the powers that be – the medical people – at the time?

RP: In the case of Koch – I think the way Koch tells the story is that they couldn't understand, and he actually makes sort of almost a case for rational behavior on the part of the government and the medical associations, just in terms of their being badly educated, badly motivated authoritarian people. They simply couldn't see, and didn't want to learn what these people were saying. My professors all the way through college and graduate school treated Otto Warburg's work as a strange, quaint idea, of this very famous powerful German, even though he got the Nobel Prizes and is recognized as solving both ends of the essential oxidative cellular mechanism. His applying that to cancer, which he very early, was simply put down as a character flaw in this otherwise great scientist.

JB: It seems, I can see maybe they wouldn't understand and they would shun him, but to try to kill Dr. Koch actually shows that they were threatened by him.

RP: Uh, yeah. I think the way to understand it, really, even though Koch does tell the story in his book – I think the best way get insight is to read Herbert Bailey's book about krebiozen, because they were contemporaries. Andrew Ivy was one of the biggest establishment doctors in the country – the founder of several medical associations, and Vice President and head of the medical school at the University of Illinois, and he was chosen to help found the Naval Medical research institute in Bethesda, and ran it for a year during the second world war, and the Board of the American Medical Association, which he had belonged to, had chosen him as America's representative to the Nuremburg Trials, to testify on universal medical ethics. He was simply one of the biggest of shots in American Medicine.

And when this Yugoslav doctor had a cancer treatment, he thought, came to the United States, he quickly found out who the big shot was in Medicine and took his idea to Andrew Ivy, who was an intelligent person and had been thinking along the lines that cancer is the loss of some restraining process. I don't think he was quite up to the speed of Koch and Szent-Gyorgyi, but he understood the thinking that was fairly common at that time that there might just be a lack of a restraint that allows cells to start dividing.

And this line of thinking has been demonstrated over and over. For example, many people don't think about why our liver is as big as it is, and no bigger, when it has such a capacity for producing new cells. If you cut off half an animal's liver, it will re-grow to the right size. And if you join two rats together in their circulation and remove the liver of one rat, the liver of the second rat grows to be twice its normal size so it can handle the circulation of both animals.

This is a well-documented theory that it was these chemicals of restraint were called chalones – meaning a restraining influence. It can be demonstrated in the cornea, and in the skin, and in any organ that is able to divide, if you take an extract of that and add it to the growing culture, the cell division stops. So it's specific to each tissue so that the organism knows how much of a given tissue or organ it should have. And when that amount of chalone is produced, cell division stops. And so the absence of that has been considered an obvious influence in abnormal tumor production. People were – at that

time-- many people were working on tissue extracts trying to get that sort of stuff in a form that would be general enough to apply to a tumor of different tissues. And some people would extract tumors – one of the main lines of thinking was to extract it from urine or from the kidney, or from the liver – something that had a general regulatory function. Szent-Gyorgyi was extracting it from urine, and he called it “retin vs. promine.” Promine being the amino promoter of growth, and retin being the restraining influence. For example, **Lionel Strong** who developed the mice colonies that are in common use – he developed strains that 100% of them will get breast cancer. And with using extracts of liver, Lionel Strong showed that he could not only cure the cancer of the individual, but even that individual's descendents for several generations would be free of cancer. So he was demonstrating hereditary imprinting as well as the chalone principle of tissue extract curing.

JB: He was getting the chalone straight from the liver.

RP: He had a time when he was using shark liver, but I talked to him, and he said that he thought that any kind of liver would have the active material, and I experimented with beef liver and so on, and you get a lot of the substances that are similar to what Koch was working with in the kind of extract that you do. Anyway, Andrew Ivy knew about this other line of research, so when the Yugoslav doctor had said that he had vaccinated horses with an organism that causes tumors, *Actinomyces bovis*, and produced tumors, and then extracted the blood of the horses, let the blood clot, and then extracted it the way these other people were doing liver and blood, urine and so on. The technique I learned from Lionel Strong was to use absolute ethanol, grind up the liver, into a fine powder in the absolute ethanol and then evaporate the alcohol from the material you extracted, and then re-suspend it in water. That was the exactly the technique that Ivy learned from the **Durovics**, and it was a standard technique for getting things that are slightly oil-soluble and slightly water-soluble. It forms a sort of emulsion when you take it up in the water, and the Durovics got his attention because he knew that it was in principle biologically reasonable, and so he immediately was interested in testing it. And he took patients whose doctors said they had only about one or two months' life expectancy because they were so seriously sick with cancer. And in these people who were on their last legs, he saw dramatic results. At that point, he wasn't looking for a cure – he was using very tiny doses, like 10 micrograms per patient, but one injection would cause a very high proportion of the patients to have dramatic improvement. He reported this after about two years of tests in which a lot of the patients did end up dying, but the responses to one or two injections were so amazing, that Ivy said, “This stuff has to be studied in better ways – there has to be double-blind studies, and so on.”

This book by **Herbert Bailey** documents in just the most horrifying way, the ways in which the power structure started acting. One after another, Andrew Ivy's positions were taken away from him. He was fired from his Vice Presidency, and then his professorship; he was kicked out of even the scientific organizations that he had founded. One after the other, they would threaten him and say, “You will be punished if you don't give it to us.” And he would say, “No, it should be tested publicly,” and he would lose another job. And he went from being at the very top of American Medicine to basically being a community college teacher for the rest of his life. And as late as 1964, he was interviewed and asked if he didn't regret having stuck by his insistence that the stuff should be tested, and he said “No” he still thought it should be tested.

JB: Good for him. And that's because he thought it should be tested, he wasn't saying it was a cure-all or anything.

RP: No.

JB: Well, it makes you wonder what the motives are.

RP: Well, the book – a good place to start – even before reading the book is to look at the congressional record from the 88<sup>th</sup> congress and the material that Illinois senator **Paul Douglas** introduced into the congressional record. Sworn testimony and a very ordered presentation in a compact forum, documenting the things that Bailey says in the book. And among those are naming people, two big drug companies, and the Treasurer of the American Medical Association offering him as much as two and a half million dollars – offering the Durovics two and a half million dollars – for the rights to the chemical. They refused, and the offers are still existing documents of the offers and basically a conspiracy, and he said it in print. And over and over, like the senator in the congressional record said, “If this wasn't true, why aren't these chemical companies and the AMA officials and the AMA itself, and the Journal of the AMA, why aren't they suing for slander, because these are such horrible things that are said about them, that they engaged in a criminal conspiracy to control something that they thought, apparently, was of tremendous economic value?” One of the most convincing things is that they refused to comment, even on why they wouldn't sue for slander or libel.

JB: Are you familiar with **Dr. Samuel Epstein**?

RP: Oh yeah. He's one of the still-living good guys.

JB: Yeah, I got to see his website. He is very critical of the American Cancer Society, and basically feels they are doing nothing on the prevention front. He feels that the many chemicals that are being released into the environment by industry and pharmaceuticals are causing cancer. And mammograms. He feels that mammograms are not only not useful but that they can spread cancer.

RP: Yeah, **John Gofman** – his whole book on the prevention of cancer is posted on the internet. And – Gofman – he was one of the Atomic Energy Commission's defenders of radiation in the 50's when Linus Pauling was the only scientist saying that radiation is bad for you. Everyone else supported by the government, including John Gofman, who was medical officer for the Lawrence Lab – he discovered an isotope and so on, he was a very top figure in both, in medical physics, basically, but in physics itself. And so he was put out as a defender of the safety of radiation, but in the 60's he started thinking about what he was saying. And he explained how his conversion happened – he simply started thinking about what words he was saying publicly and realized that they were crazy.

JB: He had an epiphany.

RP: And he says that two-third to three-quarters of breast cancer are caused by radiation, primarily medical radiation.

JB: Right, I was reading something that you sent me that said that bone density scans are basically X-rays. I had never known that. And I have friends who are going in for bone density scans.

RP: The terrible thing is that they are going to recommend that you do it anyway, because you are old, and old people have thinning bones, so why do they bother finding out how thin your bones are, especially when ultrasound technology exists that is more meaningful. It will actually tell you the strength of your bones, not just how dense they are. And in the Journal of the American Medical Association itself, someone published little graphs showing tremendous inaccuracy of the bone scan because of differences in fat and water in the tissues. And some people have a lot of fat in their bone marrow, and others have very little fat, but a lot of fluid. And estrogen, for example, affects the



distribution of fat and fluid in your body. This technique – one of the reasons the bone scan is popular is that estrogen seems to increase bone density, where all through the early 60's and 70's, all of the evidence showed when you grind up the bones, they are not made more dense by estrogen. The estrogen causes calcium retention, but no increase of bone density. But the X-ray technique used now for scanning does sometimes give an apparent increase in bone density, but this publication shows that the fat-water artifact which can be influenced by estrogen could explain any apparent benefit. And since the ultrasound measures the strength as well as the density, there are many overwhelming arguments why nobody should ever have a bone scan. Besides being harmless, and meaningful and accurate, the ultrasound happens to stimulate bone growth, where X-rays accelerate bone loss. Every time you get a bone scan, your bones are going to go away a little faster, just for the X-rays.

JB: So that applies to the X-rays in the teeth, too.

RP: Yeah, and the X-rays bounce off your teeth and jawbones and accelerate the atrophy of your jawbone, but the bouncing rays go into your brain. And they know that dental X-rays cause thyroid cancer and eye cancer, cancer of the eyeball, and if they are bouncing to that extent, obviously they are going through the brain, and the brain is the most sensitive of all tissues to radiation. So a great way to produce Alzheimer's disease ought to be to have lots of dental X-rays.

JB: Wow, this gives me another reason to be not so happy about going to the dentist.

RP: <laughs>

JB: Do you think they could use ultrasound on your teeth?

RP: Yeah. There are instruments already existing that give very fine resolution. All you need is a transducer that you can put in your mouth, and someone has made those. And you can produce very fine resolution pictures of any structures you want to.

JB: So all you dentists out there who are listening, take note.

Maybe you should say the name of Herbert Bailey's book? It's probably out of print, isn't it?

RP: Maybe one of them is in print. You can find them somewhere – old book stores would be where I would look. Or libraries. The pressure caused the first publisher to fold up within a year. Book reviews were canceled, and positive reviews were canceled. Negative, dishonest reviews were published. So isn't a popular book to publish or re-publish, so it's probably going to be hard to find.

JB: I see. But the name it was – it was by Herbert Bailey, and it was called Krebiozen?

RP: Yeah, one was K: Krebiozen, Key to Cancer, something like that. The title is clear enough.

JB: So it's K R E B –

RP: I O Z E N.

JB: I O Z E N, Okay.

---

Resources:

Andrew C. Ivy: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Andrew\\_Conway\\_Ivy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Andrew_Conway_Ivy)

<http://www.whale.to/cancer/ivy.html>

Moses Gomberg: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moses\\_Gomberg](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moses_Gomberg)

Barry Commoner: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Barry\\_Commoner](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Barry_Commoner)

William F. Koch: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William\\_Frederick\\_Koch](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Frederick_Koch)

<http://www.rexresearch.com/koch/kochindex.htm>

Otto Warburg: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Otto\\_Heinrich\\_Warburg](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Otto_Heinrich_Warburg)

<http://www.alkalizeforhealth.net/Loxygen2.htm>

Albert Szent Gyorgyi: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albert\\_Szent-Gy%C3%B6rgyi](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albert_Szent-Gy%C3%B6rgyi)

<http://profiles.nlm.nih.gov/WG/>

Bronsted-Lowry Theory of Acids: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bronsted-Lowry\\_acid-base\\_theory](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bronsted-Lowry_acid-base_theory)

Krebiozen: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Krebiozen>

Stevan Durovic: <http://www.whale.to/m/hayley1.html>

Lionel Strong: <http://mitsloan.mit.edu/iwer/pdf/murray.pdf>

Herbert Bailey's K: Krebiozen: Key to Cancer: <http://www.amazon.com/K-Krebiozen-Key-To-Cancer/dp/B000TZ3GXO>

Paul Douglas, FDA, etc. Durovics and Krebiozen:

<http://bulk.resource.org/courts.gov/c/F2/479/479.F2d.242.71-1658.html>

<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/AboutFDA/WhatWeDo/History/OralHistories/SelectedOralHistoryTranscripts/UCM265213.pdf>

<http://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/WhatWeDo/History/OralHistories/SelectedOralHistoryTranscripts/ucm073370.htm#Krebiozen>

Samuel Epstein: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samuel\\_Epstein](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samuel_Epstein)

<http://www.preventcancer.com/about/epstein.htm>

[http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Health/Cancer\\_Growth\\_Industry.html](http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Health/Cancer_Growth_Industry.html)

[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=71XP7Qpg\\_ik](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=71XP7Qpg_ik)

John Gofman: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John\\_Gofman](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Gofman)

<http://www.whale.to/a/gofman.html>