

Mammograms? No Maam!!

Conventional medical researchers have now proven what the cancer industry doesn't want you to know: **Mammograms cause cancer.**

Today, groundbreaking new research tells the story of why women at high risk of breast cancer should avoid mammograms!

Mammograms cause breast cancer, groundbreaking new research declares

by S. L. Baker, features writer

(NaturalNews) Ever since the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force took a look, finally, at the scientific evidence and announced new recommendations earlier this month for routine mammograms -- specifically that women under 50 should avoid them and women over 50 should only get them every other year -- the reactions from many women, doctors and the mainstream media have reached the point of near hysteria (http://www.naturalnews.com/027558_m...). Not getting annual mammograms, some say, means countless women will receive a virtual death sentence because their breast **tumors** won't be discovered. ***But what is rarely discussed about mammograms is this: the tests could actually be causing many cases of breast cancer.***

In fact, a new study just presented at the annual meeting of the Radiological Society of North America (RSNA), concludes the low-dose radiation from **annual mammography screening significantly increases breast cancer risk in women with a genetic or familial predisposition to breast cancer.** This is particularly worrisome because women who are at high **risk** for breast cancer are regularly pushed to start mammograms at a younger age -- as early as 25 -- and that means they are exposed to more radiation from mammography earlier and for more years than women who don't have breast cancer in their family trees.

"For women at high risk for breast cancer, screening is very important, but a careful approach should be taken when considering mammography for screening young women, particularly under age 30," Marijke C. Jansen-van der Weide, Ph.D., an epidemiologist in the Department of Epidemiology and Radiology at University Medical Center Groningen in the Netherlands, said in a statement to the media. "Further, repeated exposure to low-dose radiation should be avoided."

Dr. Jansen-van der Weide and colleagues analyzed peer-reviewed, published medical **research** to investigate whether low-dose radiation exposure affects breast cancer risk among high-risk women. Out of the six studies included in this analysis, four looked at the effect of exposure to low-dose radiation among breast cancer gene mutation carriers. The other two studies traced the impact of radiation on women with a family history of breast cancer. The researchers took the combined data from all these research projects and then calculated odds ratios to estimate the risk of breast cancer caused by radiation.

The results? All the high-risk women in the study who were exposed to low-dose mammography type radiation had an increased risk of breast cancer that was 1.5 times greater than that of high-risk women who had not been exposed to low-dose radiation. What's more, women at high risk for breast cancer who had been exposed to low-dose

Mammogram Hazards

radiation before the age of 20 or who had five or more exposures to low-dose radiation were **2.5 times more likely to develop breast cancer** than high-risk women not exposed to low-dose radiation.

Bottom line: any supposed benefit of early tumor detection using mammograms in young women with familial or genetic predisposition to breast cancer is offset by the potential risk of radiation-induced cancer. "Our findings suggest that low-dose radiation increases breast cancer risk among these young high-risk women, and a careful approach is warranted," Dr. Jansen-van der Weide said in the press statement.

The mammogram scam exposed

Incredibly, although it is rarely reported in the [mainstream media](#), the new study follows on the heels of several others that have already sounded the warning that mammograms may cause breast cancer. For example, [NaturalNews](#) covered a Johns Hopkins study published earlier this year in the *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* (http://www.naturalnews.com/025560_c...) that warned radiation exposure from annual mammograms could trigger breast malignancies in women with a strong family history of breast and/or ovarian cancers who have altered genes (identified as BRCA1 or BRCA2).

And it may not be only women with a familial risk for breast cancer who are at extra risk from mammography radiation. As [NaturalNews](#) covered last year, a report published in the American Medical Association's *Archives of Internal Medicine* found breast cancer rates increased significantly in four Norwegian counties after women there began getting mammograms every two years. In fact, the start of screening mammography programs throughout Europe has been linked to an increased incidence of breast cancer (<http://www.naturalnews.com/024901.html>).

Comments by the Health Ranger, Editor of NaturalNews.com

Mammogram pushers now have nothing left to stand on. The complete and utter hoax of mammography has now been wholly discredited through a flurry of groundbreaking studies *performed by conventional medicine researchers!* Yes, even the industry's own former advocates now admit mammography harms far more women than it helps.

Why? Because *mammography causes the very disease it claims to "detect"*. It's much like a clever sleight-of-hand magician's trick where they reach for your ear and suddenly produce a coin that was presumably hidden there. But as everybody knows, *they put it there themselves!* Mammograms offer a similar kind of sleight-of-hand trick (or sleight-of-breast, as the case may be) by actually generating the very disease they claim to find. If so many women hadn't already been harmed by mammography, the whole thing would be quite hysterical.

"Early detection saves lives," they say. Except they stupidly forget to tell women the other side of the story: **"Mammograms cause cancer."** And if you're gullible enough to actually irradiate your breasts every year, don't be surprised -- shocked! -- if they someday find tumors in them.

For more information:

<http://www.naturalnews.com/mammogra...>

Breast Cancer Screening Exposed As Near-Useless: 2,970 Women Must Be Screened to Save One

by David Gutierrez, staff writer

(NaturalNews) A new study has cast fresh doubt on the widespread assumption that regular mammograms save lives, showing that 2,970 women must be screened for breast cancer in order to prevent even one death.

"For a woman in the screening subset of mammography-detectable cancers, there is a less than 5 percent chance that a mammogram will save her life," wrote the researchers from the University of Nebraska and the John H. Stroger Jr. Hospital of Cook County, Ill. "By comparing mammography's life-saving absolute benefit with its expected harms, a well-informed woman along with her physician can make a reasonable decision to screen or not to screen for [breast cancer](#)."

Breast cancer is the most common cause of [cancer](#) death among women and the fifth most common cause of overall cancer death worldwide. An estimated 1.2 million new cases are diagnosed around the world each year, leading to 500,000 deaths.

A mammogram uses X-ray radiation to take an image of the breast that can then be evaluated for irregularities such as tumors. U.S. federal guidelines recommend that all women aged 40 and above receive a mammogram once every one to two years.

In the new study, published in the journal *BioMed Central Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, researchers examined [breast cancer screening](#) and mortality data from a variety of different sources. They found that the benefit of [mammograms](#) in saving lives increased gradually with age, corresponding to the increase in the overall risk of breast cancer death (independent of screening).

A woman's absolute risk of developing breast cancer between the ages of 55 and 70 is approximately 6 percent, with a 1 percent chance of breast cancer causing her death. The researchers concluded that starting at age 50, 1.8 lives would be saved for every 1,000 women who was screened consistently for 15 years.

"In other words," the researchers wrote, "2,970 women must be screened once to save one life."

This means that undergoing regular [cancer screening](#) at age 40 only decreases a woman's risk of dying from cancer by 0.1 percent. Another way of putting the same data is that out of every 23 [cancers](#) detected, one life will be saved.

Researcher and radiologist John Keen emphasized that he does not believe mammograms are useless, and that he performs the procedures himself. He does not believe, however, that women and doctors have a realistic understanding of what benefits regular breast cancer screening can actually provide.

"The people who are promoting screening are not explaining it," he said. "They are pushing the wrong statistics. I am saying that women need to be told the benefits and the harms and they need to make their own decision."

Keen blasted the condescending attitude implicit in taking the decision of whether to screen

Mammogram Hazards

out of the hands of the patients involved.

"You can use the word paternalistic, and that's what it is," he said. "We don't trust women to make their own decisions about whether to screen. We just tell them to screen. We just say [mammography](#) saves lives."

The researchers noted that mammograms may still provide benefits even to women whose lives they do not save, however.

"We have assumed that a 'life saved' means screening helps cure one woman with breast cancer who would otherwise have died from the [disease](#) without screening," they wrote. "However, all women with breast cancer may theoretically benefit from screening mammography through slowing the disease and therefore slightly prolonging their lives."

Yet the procedures also carry risks. Mammograms may result in "false positives," leading healthy women to undergo traumatic biopsies or even cancer treatment. In other cases, non-aggressive cancers may still be treated aggressively, leading to breast removal or severe side effects from drug and radiation therapy.

"Insurance companies and patients alike must pay for these tests," Kane said. "They are buying something. I just want to tell them what they are buying."

Other researchers have raised concerns that the radiation exposure women undergo during mammograms may actually raise their risk of breast or other cancers. Concern over unnecessary radiation exposure is the reason that doctors do not recommend mammograms for most women under the age of 40, in whom breast cancer risk tends to be low.

In addition, some [health](#) professionals warn that the compaction experienced by the breast during screening may rupture blood vessels and cause cancers to spread to other parts of the body.

Screening advocates disputed the study's findings with numbers of their own. According to Julietta Patnick, director of cancer screening programs for the United Kingdom's National Health Service, an independent review panel has concluded that screening in the United Kingdom saves one life for every 8 cancers detected. Robert Smith, director of cancer screening for the American Cancer Society, said that over the course of 20 years, one life could be saved by screening 465 women for 7 years each.

The new study is not the first to call the effectiveness of mammography into question, however. A 2001 study known as the Cochrane analysis found that while one life would be saved if 2,000 women underwent regular screening for 10 years, another 10 women would undergo unnecessary treatment such as surgery or radiation. They noted that it was difficult to determine which cancers would have led to death or even symptoms in the absence of treatment. The researchers concluded that it is "not clear whether screening does more harm than good."

The Cochrane analysis reviewed seven different studies including a total of 500,000 women.

Sources for this story include: www.telegraph.co.uk; www.theepochtimes.com ; sciencecodex.com.

Americans Exposed to Atomic Bomb Levels of Radiation through Medical Imaging, CT Scans, Mammograms

by Mike Adams, the Health Ranger, NaturalNews Editor

(NaturalNews) A new report released by the *National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement* reveals that Americans' exposure to radiation has increased more than 600 percent over the last three decades. Most of that increase has come from patients' exposure to radiation through **medical imaging scans** such as CT scans and mammograms.

Most patients have no awareness of the dangers of ionizing radiation due to medical imaging scans. Virtually no patients -- and few doctors -- realize that **one CT scan exposes the body to the equivalent of several hundred X-rays** (<http://www.naturalnews.com/023582.html>), for example. Most women undergoing **mammograms** have no idea that the radiation emitted by **mammography** machines actually *causes cancer* by exposing heart and **breast tissue** to dangerous ionizing radiation that directly causes **DNA damage**.

Even low doses of radiation can add up to significant increases in lifelong **cancer risk**. A study published in the *New England Journal of Medicine* (2007) found that survivors of the 1945 atomic bombs unleashed on **Japan** during World War II still faced significant increases in lifetime cancer risk. And the levels of radiation to which these particular study subjects were exposed is equivalent to receiving only two or three **CT scans**, explains an ABC News story (<http://abcnews.go.com/Health/Cancer...>).

Yes, it's true: A couple of CT scans can expose your body to as much radiation as standing a few miles from an atomic bomb explosion. This is a simple scientific fact.

Is modern **medicine** priming the population for a wave of future **cancers**?

Exposure to CT scans and mammograms today can lead to cancer much later in life. As ABC News reports, Dr. Len Lichtenfeld, the deputy chief medical officer of the American Cancer Society, says, "Radiation exposure from these scans is not inconsequential and can lead to later cancers."

Thanks to the widespread use of **medical imaging** scans, hospitals are also becoming a major source of **nuclear waste material**. See the **NaturalNews** report on that topic here: <http://www.naturalnews.com/025711.html>

This material can be seized by **terrorists** and used to make dirty bombs. Thus, **hospitals are now a major source for potential tools for terrorists**.

The bottom-line question in all this is simple: Are medical imaging devices causing more harm than good? And do mammograms actually *create future cancer patients* by causing cancer in the breast? In my view, the answers to both these questions are a resounding YES. Medical imaging does more than just detect cancer, it also causes cancer! And that's in the financial interests of the drug companies and cancer clinics that profit from treating cancer.

Here's what other **doctors**, authors and health experts have to say on the subject of CT scans, mammograms and radiation:

Authors' Quotes on Radiation and CT Scans

Below, you'll find selected quotes from noted authors on the subject of Radiation and Ct Scans. Feel free to quote these in your own work provided you give proper credit to both the original author quoted here and this NaturalNews page.

After four years of work, it became disturbingly clear to the research team that the main cause of the rising rates of **leukemia** was medical **radiation**, in the form of diagnostic medical **x-rays**. The use of **radiation** in **cancer treatment** employs high-intensity **x-rays**. Much higher doses are involved in cancer treatment than in diagnostic **x-rays**, because the purpose is to kill cells, or at least cripple their ability to reproduce. While a typical diagnostic X-ray might deliver one or two rads (radiation absorbed doses) of **radiation**, a six-week course of radiotherapy delivers about 5,000 rads.

- [Reclaiming Our Health: Exploding the Medical Myth and Embracing the True Source of Healing](#) by *John Robbins*

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

Do you know, however, that one whole body scan may be equivalent to the **radiation** received during 500 **chest** x-rays? Any amount of **radiation** exposure damages cellular **DNA**, thereby increasing the risk of cancer and premature **aging**. Companies promoting these **ct scans** don't mention the **radiation**, but members of the Life Extension Foundation were told to avoid these body scans because of the **health** risks posed by this excess amount of **radiation**.

- [Disease Prevention and Treatment](#) by *The Life Extension Editorial Staff*

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

It is foolish to believe every person entering the cancer era of their lives, from age 50 on, should continually be subjected to screening **radiation** (**X-rays**, **mammograms**, CT scans) and invasive needle biopsies, in a futile attempt to detect cancer at its earliest stage. Paradoxically, all these screening methods only serve to increase the risk for cancer. Among women with detected **breast cancer**, 88% have not spread and 12% are invasive tumors.

- [You Don't Have to be Afraid of Cancer Anymore](#) by *Bill Sardi*

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

After searching for possible causes, he came to the conclusion that work-related **radiation** had done the damage. We both have had patients with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma who received **radiation** in the **chest** and then developed coronary **disease**. In cardiology, we call that **radiation** atherosclerosis. We believe **x-rays** damage endothelial cells. A prime example was a patient with multiple risk factors for CVD, including diabetes and high blood pressure. In 1995, prior to beginning New Cardiology therapy, he was treated with **radiation** for a neck tumor.

- [Reverse Heart Disease Now: Stop Deadly Cardiovascular Plaque Before It's Too Late](#) by *Stephen Sinatra, M.D. and James C., M.D. Roberts*

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

X-ray **radiation** from medical **imaging** and **ct scans** are also believed to increase the risk for cancer. A report issued by the Food & Drug Administration now suggests the risk for cancer from medical **x-rays** may be as much as 1 in 1,000. There are over 3 billion x-ray images taken annually in the world.

- [You Don't Have to be Afraid of Cancer Anymore](#) by *Bill Sardi*

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

The minimum **radiation** from a routine **chest** X-ray is 2 mrem. X-ray **radiation**

Mammogram Hazards

accumulates in the body and it is well-known that ionizing **radiation** used in X-ray procedures causes gene mutation. We can only obtain guesstimates as to its impact on health from this high level of **radiation**. Experts manage to obscure the real effects in statistical jargon such as, "The risk for lifetime fatal cancer due to **radiation** exposure is estimated to be 4 in one million per 1,000 mrem."

- [Death by Medicine](#) by Gary Null PhD, Carolyn Dean MD ND, Martin Feldman MD, Debora Rasio MD, Dorothy Smith PhD.

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

Should these patients be exposed to repeated **radiation** mammography? [Clinical Oncology Royal College Radiology 18: 257-67, 2006] Even exposure to **chest x-rays**, particularly before the age of 20, heightens the risk for breast cancer with BRCA mutations. [Journal Clinical Oncology 24:3361-6, 2006]

Quietly, the **radiation** emitted during **mammography** was reduced as digital films were introduced. How many women have now developed breast cancer from these early screenings is unknown. Virtually every woman exposed to high-dose **radiation mammography** should have been placed on antioxidant therapy.

- [You Don't Have to be Afraid of Cancer Anymore](#) by Bill Sardi

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

We are all exposed to **radiation** in the form of medical **x-rays**. Cardiologists, for instance, are exposed to a considerable amount of **radiation** because of the [nature](#) of this work. We do fluoroscopy all the time, putting in pacemakers and cardiac catheterizations. Fluoroscopy uses **x-rays** to view parts of the body on a screen, similar to the screening your luggage undergoes when you pass through airport security.

- [Reverse Heart Disease Now: Stop Deadly Cardiovascular Plaque Before It's Too Late](#) by Stephen Sinatra, M.D. and James C., M.D. Roberts

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

British physician Alice Stewart has spent much of her life investigating the connection between low-level **radiation** and higher cancer risks. Most doctors have stopped using fetal **x-rays** since Stewart's work showed that a significant increase in leukemia was found in the children of mothers who had prenatal **x-rays** taken. She has said she believes that the effects of background **radiation** coupled with exposure to **x-rays** may cause most childhood cancers.

- [Empty Harvest](#) by Dr Bernard Jenson and Mark Anderson

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

Another treatment, **radiation**, can trigger neurological symptoms, limiting the amount that can be used to treat cancer. The response of normal brain tissue to **radiation** often does not appear for weeks or months. So when someone with cancer receives **radiation**, it can be difficult to tell whether the appearance of neurological symptoms some months later stems from the cancer or from the **radiation**.

- [Keep Your Brain Young: The Complete Guide to Physical and Emotional Health and Longevity](#) by Guy McKhann, and Marilyn Albert

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

And a Wise Woman anti-cancer lifestyle offers many ways to stay cancer-free and prevent recurrence should you decide against adjuvant **radiation**. If you do choose **radiation**, it will most likely be a six-week course of therapy, and it can only be done once. (It is considered unsafe to use **radiation** therapy on the same breast twice). **Radiation** therapy can cause DNA damage, skin injuries (burns, discoloration, and permanent texture changes), nausea, [appetite](#) loss, hair loss, exhaustion, **chest** pain, pneumonia, and

Mammogram Hazards

permanent damage to the lungs, heart, and ribs (known as late-stage injuries).

- [Breast Cancer? Breast Health! The Wise Woman Way](#) by *Susun S. Weed*
- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

X-rays are another type of **radiation**. This is the most common type of human poisoning. Most individuals are poisoned as a result of medical **x-rays**, which, when performed repeatedly, result in significant tissue damage. X-ray technicians, radiologists, orthopedists, chiropractors, chiropractic assistants, **cardiologists**, dentists, and dental assistants are highly vulnerable to developing **radiation** poisoning. High tension power lines are another type of poisoning. In this case the individual is being poisoned by electromagnetic **radiation**. **Radiation** may also emanate from broadcasting centers.

- [Dr. Cass Ingram's Lifesaving Cures](#) by *Dr. Cass Ingram*
- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

History has many examples of how **radiation** use is strongly linked to an increase in cancer rates. Atomic bomb survivors in Japan have increased rates of leukemia and cancers of the breast, **thyroid**, lung, stomach and other organs, illustrating another example of how **radiation** causes cancer. In general, the breast, thyroid and bone marrow are most sensitive to the effects of ionizing **radiation**. Avoiding unnecessary medical **x-rays** is one of the best ways to reduce exposure to ionizing **radiation**.

- [Probiotic Rescue: How You can use Probiotics to Fight Cholesterol, Cancer, Superbugs, Digestive Complaints and More](#) by *Allison Tannis*
- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

Bross's work in a special article titled "Low-Level Radiation: Just How Bad Is It?" The report concluded that it was difficult to accurately assess the hazards posed by the **radiation** used in **x-rays** and cancer therapy because of the political nature of the **radiation** issue. It was hard to get clarity about the dangers, Science noted, because the matter fell within "the domain of the atomic energy establishment." It is perhaps only from within the nuclear establishment itself that the true dangers of medical **radiation** can ever be told.

- [Reclaiming Our Health: Exploding the Medical Myth and Embracing the True Source of Healing](#) by *John Robbins*
- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

Damage from **radiation** exposure accumulates over your lifetime:

- Atomic bomb survivor (35 rads at epicenter): increase up to + 35
- Mammogram (0.5-1 rad): increase + 1 per exposure of each breast. One mammogram can double a 35-year-old woman's breast cancer risk.
- Diagnostic **x-rays** for scoliosis (1.5-3 rads): increase +3 per exposure
- Fluoroscopy (7.5 rads each): increase +5 for each
- **Radiation** treatment (8,000 rads): increase +10 each

The younger you are when your breasts are exposed to **radiation**, the greater your risk.

- [Breast Cancer? Breast Health! The Wise Woman Way](#) by *Susun S. Weed*
- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

Exposure to electromagnetic energy from electric and electronic equipment has become a factor in modern life. **Radiation** protection is offered by amino acids cysteine and glutathione; Vitamins A, C, and E; minerals Selenium and Zinc. Russian clinical study reveals some benefit from Ginseng (*Eleutherococcus senticosus* (ES)). **RADIATION SICKNESS**. Caused by overexposure to **radiation** such as **x-rays**, television screens and to an atmosphere polluted by such disasters as Chernobyl.

- [Bartram's Encyclopedia of Herbal Medicine: The Definitive Guide](#) by *Thomas Bartram*
- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

Mammogram Hazards

It is claimed that the irradiated foods do not themselves become radioactive and thus are not introducing **radiation** to the consumer. The concern with **food** irradiation is that it may produce by-products that are carcinogenic and increase the incidence of leukemia and other types of cancer or disease of the liver and kidneys. These health problems may not become evident for 20 to 30 years. Most of us are very skeptical about **radiation** in general, whether it be **x-rays** or even **microwaves**, let alone gamma **radiation** of our food.

- [Staying Healthy with Nutrition: The Complete Guide to Diet and Nutritional Medicine](#) by Elson M. Haas, M.D.

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

If this process was safe and effective for someone who was in remission, then why didn't they give **radiation** to everyone, just to make sure cancer never attacked them? Why didn't the doctors, their wives, and their children take **radiation** as a preventive measure? I pictured a **radiation** drive-thru like a fast-food window. They literally fried my mother's **chest** with what I would later discover was an enormous amount of **radiation** therapy. When I saw the **radiation** burns on my mother's **chest**, I wondered if no treatment at all would have been a better bet.

- [The Cure: Heal Your Body, Save Your Life](#) by Timothy Brantley

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

This "background" **radiation** is a small amount. Medical **x-rays** used at the **dentist** to see teeth root health, **x-rays** used by physicians to investigate bone health and **mammograms** of the breast subject the body to **radiation**. Uranium miners and those living in areas close to nuclear weapons tests are exposed to higher levels of **radiation**. Ironically, some cancer treatments include **radiation** therapy to help kill cancer cells. Yet the **radiation** itself increases the risk of cancer. Historically, **radiation** was used to monitor patients with tuberculosis.

- [Probiotic Rescue: How You can use Probiotics to Fight Cholesterol, Cancer, Superbugs, Digestive Complaints and More](#) by Allison Tannis

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

Low-radiation **mammograms** are safer **mammograms**, but less **radiation** means a fuzzier picture. Standard x-rays -- rarely used any more for breasts--create an easy-to-interpret high-radiation image. Xerograms use half that **radiation**, but are twice as hard to read. Film-screen **mammography**, the latest very-low-radiation exam, gives an image that's even more difficult to interpret. More than 10 percent of all screening **mammograms** done at one large center in 1992 couldn't be read and had to be redone.

A 1994 study showed wide variation in the accuracy with which **mammograms** are interpreted.

- [Breast Cancer? Breast Health! The Wise Woman Way](#) by Susun S. Weed

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

The higher frequency radiations, from **x-rays** to nuclear **radiation**, are clearly dangerous. Electromagnetic **radiation** can be divided into two categories. The first is ionizing **radiation** and includes **x-rays**, gamma rays, and nuclear **radiation**. Exposing our body to these highly reactive ions at certain levels can dramatically affect our atomic structure. Ionizing **radiation** can actually rip electrons from atoms and molecules and directly affect cell division and cell structure.

- [Staying Healthy with Nutrition: The Complete Guide to Diet and Nutritional Medicine](#) by Elson M. Haas, M.D.

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

Mammogram Hazards

Screening **mammograms** are unsafe other ways, too: they expose sensitive breast tissues to **radiation**, and they increase your chances of having a biopsy and being overtreated for carcinoma in situ. Scientists agree that there is no safe dose of **radiation**. Cellular DNA in the breast is more easily damaged by very small doses of **radiation** than thyroid tissue or bone marrow; in fact, breast cells are second only to fetal tissues in sensitivity to **radiation**. And the younger the breast cells, the more easily their DNA is damaged by **radiation**.

- [Breast Cancer? Breast Health! The Wise Woman Way](#) by *Susun S. Weed*

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

Radiation causes many undesirable internal reactions, especially in the most prolific tissues, such as the gastrointestinal tract and skin. **Radiation** therapy may affect the appetite, tastes, and the ability to eat. **Radiation** is cumulative, and many things may add to it, from color TV and microwaves to **x-rays** and fallout exposure. We need a good protective program! When living in areas with high background **radiation**, it is wise to take higher amounts of antioxidants regularly.

- [Staying Healthy with Nutrition: The Complete Guide to Diet and Nutritional Medicine](#) by *Elson M. Haas, M.D.*

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

In the **radiation oncology** departments, cancer patients routinely undergo therapy with high intensity **x-rays**, particle beams, and other types of **radiation**. Although **radiation** therapy has been successful in treating certain types of cancers, there are many cancers that are not cured either by **radiation** or by a combination of **radiation** and other orthodox medical and surgical modalities. Doctors may have once had the key to curing cancer with energy. But something happened to that priceless knowledge.

- [Vibrational Medicine: The #1 Handbook of Subtle-Energy Therapies](#) by *Richard Gerber, M.D.*

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

Radiation sickness can take many forms, including the exacerbation of existing disease states, and also differs in intensity depending on the degree of exposure to low or high levels of **radiation**. It is important to recognize that it is not just atomic explosions that create **radiation** hazards. Diagnostic **x-rays**, TV screens, and other apparently noninvasive sources need to be considered. It is beyond the scope of this book to explore the complexity of **radiation** sickness or the range of treatments available to treat the condition.

- [Health from the Seas: Freedom from Disease](#) by *John Croft*

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

It is now known that **radiation** causes mutation of the important p53 suppressor gene. For this reason, I do not recommend postlumpectomy **radiation**. Even though it may decrease the risk of a local recurrence of cancer, it does not help to inhibit metastatic cancer. Recent findings show that women receiving **mammograms** should be cautious of overexposure to **radiation** emitted by equipment that is not professionally and regularly monitored. Such equipment can deliver doses of **radiation** far above what are assumed today to be safe levels.

- [Herbal Medicine, Healing and Cancer: A Comprehensive Program for Prevention and Treatment](#) by *Donald R. Yance, J r., C.N., M.H., A.H.G., with Arlene Valentine*

- [Available on Amazon.com](#)

Sources for this story include:

- [Americans' Radiation Exposure Rises 6-Fold in 29 Years](#)
- ABC News
- [Overexposed: Imaging tests boost U.S. radiation dose](#)
- Reuters

Early Mammograms May Trigger Genetic Breast Cancer

by Sherry Baker, Health Sciences Editor

[See all articles by this author](#)

[Email this author](#)

(NaturalNews) What if a diagnostic test actually triggers the life-threatening disease it is supposed to detect? According to a Johns Hopkins study just published in the *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, that may be exactly what happens when women at risk for genetic breast cancer are subjected to radiation exposure from annual mammograms.

According to the National Cancer Institute (NCI), about 13.2 percent of women in the general U.S. population will develop breast cancer. But scientists have found that many women (especially those with a strong family history of breast and/or ovarian cancers) have altered genes, identified as BRCA1 or BRCA2, which raise the risk of breast malignancies to around 85 percent. It's important to note that women are not routinely screened for an altered BRCA gene and the test costs several thousands of dollars. So, bottom line, many women unknowingly carry this genetic risk for cancer.

Often, this hereditary form of breast cancer strikes at mid-life or younger -- so young women who have been tested and are found to have the deleterious gene are frequently advised to have their healthy breasts removed to prevent the disease. At the very least, they are told to have annual mammograms as early as 25 years of age.

But when Amy Berrington de Gonzalez, D.Phil., and colleagues at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health in Baltimore, looked at breast cancer mortality statistics in this group of women following five annual mammograms starting at various ages, they found a disturbing trend: far more cases of breast cancer developed than were expected.

In fact, the study indicates that women who underwent five mammograms between the ages of 24 and 29 would have an additional 26 breast cancers per 10,000 women due to the radiation. Mammograms between the ages of 30 and 34 would produce an excess of 20 additional cancers and, between 35 and 39, an additional 13 cancers.

However, because women with the altered BRCA gene are at such high risk for breast cancer in the first place, does the hope of identifying early cancerous lesions outweigh the risk of possibly triggering mammography-induced breast cancer? The researchers say the answer appears to be no.

That's because mammography screening would have to reduce breast cancer mortality by 51 percent to outweigh the risks of the screening procedure for women between the ages of 24 and 29, by 12 percent for those between 30 and 34, and by 4 percent for those between 30 and 34. If their assumptions are right, the researchers conclude there is no

Mammogram Hazards

benefit for mammograms in women under the age of 30 and only a marginal benefit for women between the ages of 30 and 34.

"In the absence of direct empirical data, our estimates can be used by those involved in the decision-making process for BRCA mutation carriers to assess whether the benefits from early mammographic screening are likely to outweigh the radiation risks," the researchers said in a statement to the media.

The idea that radiation might be harmful to women with this type of genetic breast cancer isn't new. Back in 2001, an article in *Medscape*, an on-line journal for physicians and other healthcare professionals, stated "... it is very likely that a routine mammogram for women with BRCA-1 or BRCA-2 mutations is more dangerous than for women with normal BRCA genes." What's more, the article points out that radiation therapy for BRCA-caused cancer, as well as the radiation from mammograms, may cause the malignancy to spread: "When a new tumor does appear in hereditary breast cancer, it may be a second primary (tumor) accelerated by unrepaired radiation damage while diagnosing or curing the first tumor."

It's also important to note that other researchers have questioned whether all women -- not only those with hereditary breast cancer -- are putting themselves at risk with yearly mammograms. For example, research published last fall showed that breast cancer rates soared after regular mammography was started in four Norwegian countries (<http://www.naturalnews.com/024901.html>). In addition, Samuel S. Epstein M.D., Professor Emeritus of Environmental Medicine at the University of Illinois at Chicago School of Public Health, and his colleagues conducted a review of 47 scientific articles about mammography. Their article, "Dangers and Unreliability of Mammography: Breast Examination is a Safe, Effective, and Practical Alternative", published in the *International Journal of Health Services* (2001; 31(3):605-15) concluded that mammogram screening carries many dangers, including induction and promotion of breast cancer, falsely positive and negative diagnosis of breast cancer, and over-diagnosis.

The researchers noted that a natural way to check for breast cancer has long been available that is at least as effective as mammography -- annual clinical breast examination (CBE) by a trained health professional, together with monthly breast self-examination (BSE). On the horizon: a new non-invasive breast cancer test that uses a simple saliva sample (<http://www.naturalnews.com/022774.html>).

For more information on possible health risks associated with mammography:

<http://www.eurekalert.org/jrnls/jnc...>
http://www.iicph.org/docs/dangers_o...
<http://www.hsibaltimore.com/ealerts...>
<http://cme.medscape.com/viewarticle...>

Breast Cancer Rates Soar after Mammograms and Some Cancers may Heal Naturally

by Sherry Baker, Health Sciences Editor
[See all articles by this author](#)
[Email this author](#)

Mammogram Hazards

(NaturalNews) A report just published in the Journal of the American Medical Association's *Archives of Internal Medicine* (Arch Intern Med. 2008;168[21]:2302-2303) reaches a startling conclusion. Breast cancer rates increased significantly in four Norwegian counties after women there began getting mammograms every two years. In fact, according to background information in the study, the start of screening mammography programs throughout Europe has been associated with increased incidence of breast cancer.

This raises some obvious and worrisome questions: Did the x-rays and/or the sometimes torturous compression of breasts during mammography actually spur cancer to develop? Or does this just look like an increase in the disease rate because mammography is simply identifying more cases of breast cancer?

The answer to the first question is that no one knows (and it isn't addressed in the *Archives of Internal Medicine* study). But the second question has an unexpected and – for those interested in the human body's innate ability to heal itself – potentially paradigm-shifting answer. The researchers say they can't blame the increased incidence of breast cancer on more cases being found because the rates among regularly screened women remained higher than rates among women of the same age who only received mammograms once after six years. Bottom line: the scientists conclude this indicates that some of the cancers detected by mammography would have spontaneously regressed if they had never been discovered on a mammogram and treated, usually with chemotherapy and radiation. Simply put, ***it appears that some invasive breast cancers simply go away on their own, healed by the body's own immune system.***

Per-Henrik Zahl, M.D., Ph.D., of the Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, and his research team studied breast cancer rates among 119,472 women (age 50 to 64). These research subjects were asked to participate in three rounds of screening mammograms between 1996 and 2001, as part of the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program. The scientists then compared the number of breast cancers found in this group to the rate of malignancies among a control group of 109,784 women who were the same ages in 1992, and who would have been invited for breast screenings if the program had been in place that year. Cancers were tracked using a national registry. Then, after six years, all participants were invited to undergo a one-time screening to assess for the prevalence of breast cancer.

The researchers were surprised to find that the incidence of invasive breast cancer was 22 percent higher in the group regularly screened with mammography. In fact, screened women were more likely to have breast cancer at every age.

"Because the cumulative incidence among controls never reached that of the screened group, it appears that some breast cancers detected by repeated mammographic screening would not persist to be detectable by a single mammogram at the end of six years," the authors stated in their report. ***"This raises the possibility that the natural course of some screen-detected invasive breast cancers is to spontaneously regress."***

The researchers also conclude that their findings "provide new insight on what is arguably the major harm associated with mammographic screening, namely, the detection and treatment of cancers that would otherwise regress."

This does not mean breast cancer should be ignored or not treated. After all, breast cancer is the second leading cause of death among American women. But the extraordinarily good and hopeful news is that it appears invasive breast cancer sometimes can be destroyed

Mammogram Hazards

naturally -- at least in some people -- by the body's own innate defenses.

"Although many clinicians may be skeptical of the idea, the excess incidence associated with repeated mammography demands that spontaneous regression be considered carefully," the scientists wrote in their report. "Spontaneous regression of invasive breast cancer has been reported, with a recent literature review identifying 32 reported cases. This is a relatively small number given such a common disease. ***However, as some observers have pointed out, the fact that documented observations are rare does not mean that regression rarely occurs. It may instead reflect the fact that these cancers are rarely allowed to follow their natural course.***"

In an editorial in the *Archives of Internal Medicine* that accompanies the breast cancer study, Robert M. Kaplan, Ph.D., of the University of California, Los Angeles, and Franz Porzsolt, M.D., Ph.D., of Clinical Economics University of Ulm, Germany, wrote that the most important concern raised by the study is "how surprisingly little we know about what happens to untreated patients with breast cancer. In addition to not knowing the natural history of breast cancer for younger women, we also know very little about the natural history for older women. We know from autopsy studies that a significant number of women die without knowing that they had breast cancer (including ductal carcinoma in situ). The observation of a historical trend toward improved survival does not necessarily support the benefit of treatment."