

FOCUS ON HEALTH

RATH INTERNATIONAL REGIONAL INFORMATION



NATURAL THERAPIES SAVED MY LIFE!

Cedric Fisher tells his story to Paul Anthony Taylor

Being diagnosed with cancer can affect people in very different ways. Some people for example treat their body like a car, and essentially hand it over to their doctor in the hope that he or she will be able to repair the problem for them. Others meanwhile take a more proactive approach, and choose to decide for themselves the type of treatment that is likely to be most effective. Cedric Fisher, a retired fisherman and member of the UK Health Alliance, is definitely in the latter category, and is living proof that recovery from cancer is not dependent upon submitting oneself to the cut, burn and poison approach (surgery, radiation and chemotherapy) favoured by orthodox medicine.

In mid 1996 Cedric was getting problems passing urine so he went to his GP who took a sample and sent it off to the laboratory for analysis. When the results came back however his GP told him that there was nothing wrong with him.

Nevertheless, as time went on the problem got worse and Cedric gradually began to experience quite severe pain.

At the beginning of November 1999 he had an appointment with another GP in the practice, who gave him an examination and sent him to the nurse for a blood test. A few weeks later Cedric was diagnosed with Prostate Cancer, and was told

by the doctor that his PSA level was 65.8.

PSA (prostate-specific antigen) is a protein produced by the cells of the prostate gland, and the PSA test measures the level of PSA in the blood. The higher a man's PSA level, the more likely it is that cancer is present. Normal levels generally range from 0 ng/ml to 4 ng/ml, and so Cedric's PSA level was significantly elevated.



Cedric Fisher

Things then began to go from bad to worse, and Cedric was sent to the hospital for another blood test, biopsies and a bone scan. By then his PSA count was 68.5 and rising. The bone scan came back clear but Cedric was told that he had a large metastatic tumour. Surgery was not recommended, his doctors told him, because he would

have only have about a 6 per cent chance of recovery. They therefore gave him some hormones to take, in the hope that these would suppress the cancer, and told him to come back in two months.

By this time Cedric was in a lot of pain. "I had to lie down all the time just to try and be comfortable," he told me. "The worst thing was that I didn't feel that I had any support. There was no advice about diet or anything like that. I was just left to fend for myself."

Despite the pain, one day Cedric decided to go out for a drive, feeling terrible. Parking his car in the town centre he went for a walk, completely unaware that what he was to do next would come to mark the beginning of his recovery.

Passing a health food shop Cedric saw that the door was open and so walked in. A man asked him if he wanted any help, and Cedric told him that he had just been diagnosed with inoperable prostate cancer. The man turned out to be the owner of the shop, and recommended that Cedric try Essiac, along-side the hormone treatment.

The generic name for a herbal tea, Essiac has become a popular alternative remedy for cancer, containing Burdock Root, Sheep Sorrel, Slippery Elm and Turkey Rhubarb.

CONTENTS:

NEWS FROM THE UK HEALTH ALLIANCE

Page 2

NATURAL SWEETENERS

Page 3

THE STORY BEHIND THE LEGAL CHALLENGE TO THE EU FOOD SUPPLEMENTS DIRECTIVE

Page 4

SLOW DOWN AND SMELL THE ROSES

Page 8

Cedric bought the Essiac, thinking that given his poor prognosis he had nothing to lose by giving it a try. The results were remarkable. "Ten days later I was able to sit down without any pain," said Cedric "and people didn't even think I had cancer."

The improvements didn't stop there however, and within three months his PSA was down to 7.9.

Cedric was much heartened by this, and decided to look around and see what else he could do to bring about further improvements in his health.

"I decided to look after myself, changing my diet, giving up milk and red meat," he told me. "I started buying all organic food, I don't smoke or drink and I gave up using the microwave."

Shortly afterwards Cedric was introduced to Mali Klein, who researches and is the co-author with Sheila Snow of two books about Renee Caisse's research

into Essiac herbal tea. Mali taught Cedric how to grow his own herbs, and showed him how to mix them to make his own herbal tea. With Mali's help Cedric eventually became confident enough to stop buying the Essiac product from the health shop and began to use his own herbal tea instead.

Since then Cedric has never looked back. "I have been taking Essiac continually since the diagnosis," he told me. "I also started using diluted Sheep Sorrel solution as an enema twice a week. I had always had a lot of pain in my back and neck, but that has now gone. I used to get blinding headaches, but not any more. I had suffered with haemorrhoids since I was a teenager, and now they've gone as well. I used to have a sensitive stomach. I couldn't eat very spicy food and not a lot of vegetables. Now I can eat just about anything."

When Cedric saw the consultant again he was told that his prostate was back

to normal and that there wasn't any sign of the tumour on the scans. "My PSA count was down to 2.8," said Cedric. "That was when all the trouble started because the oncologist wanted me to have radiotherapy."

Astonishingly, despite the disappearance of the tumour the oncologist was still insistent that Cedric should have 32 radiotherapy treatments. "I was worried about this," said Cedric, "because I had heard of other people having a really bad time after they had radiotherapy. It might have helped the cancer but it messed up everything else. I didn't want that."

Cedric decided to refuse the radiotherapy, which resulted in the consultant telling him curtly that he wouldn't be offered the chance to have it again. Nevertheless, and despite further pressure from his GP, Cedric remained adamant that he wouldn't have any radiotherapy unless his PSA count started going up again and there was no alternative.

There can be little doubt that Cedric made the right decision. "My energy levels are good, my appetite is good and I regularly go through the night without getting up to go to the toilet," he says.

Over the past 5-6 years Cedric has done a lot of research into various supplements and diet. This has enabled him to help not just himself but also other can-

cer sufferers as well. "Dr Rath's Cellular Medicine is one of the main things I recommend and use," he says.

"Drinking water is also very important," he added "at least 2 litres (filtered) every day. Also a healthy diet, preferably dairy free and with as much organic food as possible."

Cedric has clearly learned a great deal from his experiences. "Help for people with cancer is scarce," he explained "and so you have to work hard to help yourself and change your ideas and way of life."

An enthusiastic member of the UK Health Alliance, Cedric strongly believes that it is a good idea to work together to help one another, and hopes his story will be of encouragement to others.

Now 64 years of age - and still going strong well over six years after having been diagnosed with inoperable prostate cancer - he is happy to offer help and advice to other cancer sufferers, and can be contacted on 01253-727706.

NEWS FROM THE UK HEALTH ALLIANCE

As many of you will know, things have been a little quiet in the UK Health Alliance over the past few years despite our best intentions.

This year we aim to rectify this and during April and May we have been holding a number of regional meetings with our members. These meetings have been informal in nature and their principal aim has been to find out how we, as an organization, can better assist you, as an Alliance Member. In addition however we also wanted to give you the opportunity to meet up with other members in your area.

Alliance members in Europe meet up with each other regularly and find talk-

ing about their own experiences and listening to the experiences of others very helpful in their work. We hope therefore that these meetings will have proved beneficial to everyone and that they have given people the chance to express their views on how they would like to see the UK Alliance progress in the future. We have certainly taken a lot away from the meetings, and a number of interesting proposals and ideas were put to us for our consideration.

As well as wishing to spread vital knowledge regarding Cellular Medicine and its health benefits, there is also the need to encourage people to become involved in activities and take action over the very real threat to natural remedies posed by the EU Food Supplements Directive. Many people are still blissfully unaware of this Directive and the effect that it could eventually have on our ability to choose effective supplements. As a result "Action Days" are currently being organised all over Europe, and as we mentioned at our

meetings with you, with your support we are now hoping to initiate similar events here in the UK.

Together with the new brochures which became available at the beginning of March we were able to hand out a number of additional information materials at the regional meetings. These proved to be very popular and we should be getting further stock of them very soon should you require more copies.

In organising the regional meetings we tried to cover as many parts of the country as we could, and regret that we were not able to cover more areas than we did. Nevertheless, we were

very pleased with the turnout and the many constructive discussions that we had on how best to proceed with the Alliance here in the UK. Your input is valuable to us and we welcomed your ideas. Having attended a meeting and met others in your area we hope that this will have given you a renewed enthusiasm to help the UK Alliance grow.

Since Dr Rath's last appearance in the UK in May 2000, many of you have been asking when you might have the opportunity to hear him speak again. As such we are delighted to announce that there are plans to hold a much larger conference here towards the end of the year that we hope Dr Rath will

be able to attend.

With a few more meetings still to go this month, we shall update you in the next issue of this magazine on what action we shall be taking as a result of your input. In the meantime we would like to thank all those who were able to attend. We hope you enjoyed the meetings as much as we did!

The next issue of the magazine will include an update on what action we shall be taking as a result of your input. In the meantime we would like to thank all those who were able to attend. We hope you enjoyed the meetings as much as we did!

Cara Mulley

NATURAL SWEETENERS

By Marie Coe

As a Type 2 diabetic who also needs to lose some weight, doesn't like her coffee unsweetened and is not happy about artificial sweeteners, I was very pleased to hear about Stevia, a completely natural sugar alternative made from a South American plant. One snag though, the EU does not permit it to be sold anywhere in the European Union. Could this be due to the pharmaceutical companies lobbying against anything that is natural and cannot be patented by them, I wonder? After all, they do make most of the artificial sweeteners.

Luckily for me a friend who went to a family wedding in Brazil brought me back some Stevia in liquid form – excellent, and my daughter has recently brought me some more from the USA and Canada.

However, a few weeks ago I heard of another sweetener known as xylitol which is available here! So, I did a little research and was surprised to find that the modern history of xylitol goes back to the Second World War, when Finland was suffering from a major shortage of sugar. Whilst searching for an alternative to sugar some Finnish scientists apparently rediscovered xylitol, a natural substance that

had originally been manufactured in 1891 by a German chemist.

Xylitol was originally made from birch wood but is now more commonly manufactured from cornhusks. It has 75% fewer carbohydrates than sugar, a low glycemic index value of 7, it's good for your teeth (and actually helps to keep them healthy!), it's excellent in cooking, and it tastes great. A 100% natural alternative to sugar, xylitol can be found in fruit, vegetables and is also produced naturally in our own bodies.

I am told that Patrick Holford, the well known nutritionist, was asked to investigate xylitol, liked what he found and now has recipes in his new cookbook that use it. I bought a 225 gram bag of granulated xylitol at a local health food shop for £2.69.

So, why haven't we heard more about it xylitol the last 50 odd years? Have the pharmaceutical companies not heard of it either, or are they hoping that we, the public, can be kept in ignorance?

Excessive use of regular sugar can lead to all sorts of illnesses like diabetes, cardio-vascular disease, obesity and many other problems. Consumption of artifi-

cial sweeteners is similarly linked to a whole host of diseases, including epilepsy, migraine and multiple sclerosis. All of these conditions are treated with drugs. Could it be that the pharmaceutical industry doesn't want us to use safe, natural sugar alternatives because they reduce the likelihood of disease?

It makes you wonder, doesn't it?



Stevia rebaudiana

THE STORY BEHIND THE LEGAL CHALLENGE TO THE EU FOOD SUPPLEMENTS DIRECTIVE

Dr Robert Verkerk, Executive & Scientific Director of the Alliance for Natural Health, takes us through the story about one of the UK's most important health freedom battles of recent years: the battle to stop bans on food supplements by a misguided EU Directive. As you will discover, he believes that the battle is far from over – and that there is still everything to play for

On 12 March 2002, one of the most controversial Directives to have emerged from the European law-making sausage machine was narrowly voted through by a majority of 541 MEPs sitting that day in the European Parliament. This, let us not forget, is the system that now controls the curvature of bananas sold in Europe. The Directive in question was of course the Food Supplements Directive – the mechanism proposed by the EU to harmonise laws on food supplements across the European Union. The Directive's secondary objective was supposedly consumer protection, yet it allowed companies to put caustic soda or sodium fluoride into tablets which could then be sold on to consumers. Both of these compounds are poisons and are used to either kill bacteria in drains or in teeth. Neither could be regarded as being good for you.

Like so many of the more radical measures from Brussels, the Directive's initial impact was non-existent. The regulators like to give industry and consumers a transition period to help them adjust to a law which might some day rob them of their livelihood, or in this case, in addition to doing this, it would prevent us consumers getting the nutrients we

so badly need because they are increasingly scarce in our food supply.

EU madness

This Directive had taken 10 years of negotiation to get it to the proposal stage. Some of its biggest problems arise from the fact that it has been pulled and pushed around by so many competing interests. It was actually passed into EU law (March 2002), and subsequently transposed into Member State laws (from July 2003), full of holes – black holes – that lacked any form of transparency. One of the most obvious of these was its badly deficient and irrational 'positive list' of allowed vitamin and mineral substances.

Since the Directive was a 'total harmonisation' directive, it meant that all trade in food supplements anywhere in Europe needed to be compliant with the Food Supplements Directive. There was no chance of escaping its ravages and living under unique national rules in particular Member States that were not keen on some of its provisions.

As far as I was concerned, the biggest travesty of the Directive was the non-

inclusion of a huge number of vitamin and mineral forms that exist in foods. For example, the EU was actually proposing to ban the very form of folic acid that exists in spinach leaves (5-methyl-tetra-hydrofolate), the form of selenium that is present in brazil nuts (selenomethionine), and the various forms of vitamin E that we find, often in insufficient quantities, in certain plant-derived oils (beta, delta and gamma tocopherols and alpha, beta, delta and gamma tocotrienols). Yet, as we seen above, rat poison and drain cleaner were on the menu.

In the UK alone, being forced to comply with the positive list would amount to a ban on around 5000 of the best vitamin and mineral products on the market. Interestingly, the ban would barely touch products that sold in supermarkets and pharmacy chains, as most of these have long been 100% RDA, largely positive list compliant products manufactured and sold by pharmaceutical companies. The positive list, it was apparent, modelled very closely the raw ingredients lists of the pharmaceutical manufacturers, which hold over 70% of the European market share of vitamin and mineral ingredients.

Although the principle of a Directive for food supplements is not in itself a bad thing, especially if it can provide a 'safe harbour' for supplements outside of a drugs regime, this Directive was going to create some very serious problems for anyone interested in making, selling or consuming concentrated sources of nutrients in the forms we would typically find in food.

Taking the case to Court

After buying myself a new pair of smart leather shoes and a matching brief case,

felt sure that my new accessories probably helped. As a deeply concerned scientist, I explained the predicament we faced with the Directive and, like any lawyer hungry for business, the lawyers soon made it clear that we almost certainly had a case worth making in a court. The considered opinion was that we would stand a better chance taking our case to the European Court of Justice, rather than the more obvious European Court of Human Rights. We needed, first and foremost, to fight our case on the basis of the negative impact it would have on small businesses trying

Stage 1: the High Court in London

After some 18 months of preparing the case, helping companies, practitioners and consumers to develop extensive data sets and witness statements, we submitted our case to the High Court in London. We worked with some of the best European lawyers in the business, including with leading barrister David Anderson QC. We needed to challenge, initially, the version of the EU Directive that had been transposed into national laws. It was simplest and easiest to initiate the case in the UK, as that's where



The ANH Team at the European Courts of Justice in January 2005

I, as the Executive Director of the newly-formed Alliance for Natural Health (ANH), together with various colleagues, visited a number of the biggest law firms in London between March and May of 2002. I was pleased that the law firms would give me the time of day, and I

to keep completely safe products on the market. The ultimate goal was to demonstrate the fact that this EU law was disproportionate, unfair, irrational and – above all – illegal.

our lawyers were based and, just as importantly, the case would be in a language we understood.

The key purpose of this first stage of our challenge was to see if the High Court would regard our case as having 'legs'

and warrant being referred on to the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg. We submitted the case on 13 October 2003 and had our hearing on 30 January 2004. Justice Richards presided on the day – and we were thrilled to see the case not only directly referred to the European Court – but also to see it expedited. It was only the second case since one connected with the BSE in beef fiasco to be expedited. Interestingly, two UK health trade associations, the National Association of

stood up before 13 judges and the Advocate General, the special legal advisor to the judges (whose opinion is followed in around 80% of cases), and presented our case.

He asked, among his many finely considered points, why the European Commission was planning on making it illegal for him to manufacture and sell pills made of dried spinach leaves labelled up with the appropriate form of folic acid. When it was the Commission's

This came on the 12th July 2005. Early that morning, with the BBC news television cameras trained on me and my PC, I received the ruling which was transmitted from Luxembourg to my email system. Given the likelihood that the ruling would follow the Advocate General's opinion, we were all hoping for some very good news, and the BBC were keen to be the first to report the effects of a dedicated few on the machinations of the European legislature. It was in many ways going to be a classic David and Goliath story.

But the ruling was different from that which we expected. It was immediately clear the judges had not gone with the Advocate General's opinion – they had not overturned the Directive. What happened then is still responsible for much of the confusion on this issue today; the claimants in the parallel case (HFMA and NAHS) immediately issued a 'doom and gloom' press release saying that the case had been lost. It seemed from the many media reports that cloned this release, that the efforts to get this far had been in vain. Just as importantly, the financial support we had received from consumers around Europe had all been for nothing.

We decided we could not issue a press release until we had a more complete understanding of the ruling and for this we needed the considered views of our barristers at Monckton Chambers - Paul Lasok in particular. By midday we had a view and around two hours later we issued our release. The difficulty, in media terms, was that we had missed the boat. Newspapers covering the case around the world had their story: the case against food supplements in Europe had apparently been lost. Our barristers' analysis, which showed a very clear silver lining, landed on deaf ears.

For the record, our barristers were of the opinion that the ruling was ingenious. It balanced nearly all of our key arguments, with the need to avoid unnecessary embarrassment of the European institutions. Even more importantly, it meant that all parties were not forced to renegotiate an over-turned



Michael Patchett-Joyce and Paul Lasok QC
of Monckton Chambers - the ANH barristers

Health Stores (NAHS) and the Health Food Manufacturers Association (HFMA) decided to throw their hats in the ring. They submitted a parallel case, which was heavily reliant on the evidence submitted by the ANH.

It was now evident that the case had legs. We then had to prepare the next stage of the case for the European Court of Justice.

Stage 2: the ECJ, Luxembourg

The big day for the oral hearing in the European Court of Justice (ECJ) in Luxembourg came on the 25 January 2005. Paul Lasok QC, our new barrister from Monckton Chambers (the other top flight barrister set in the UK), with the eloquence of a Shakespearean actor,

turn to respond, their representative, said that it was not their intention to ban such products. The judges were quick to appreciate the irrationality that was apparent.

On 5 April the same year, the Dutch Advocate General, Leendert Geelhoed, delivered his opinion. In short, he argued that the Directive was illegal on the basis that it infringed the principle of proportionality and created very significant legal uncertainty owing to its lack of transparency, particularly in relation to getting new nutrients on to the 'positive list.'

We had passed the second staging point, and were still going. We now had to await the ruling from the judges themselves.

Directive. Such a renegotiation could have landed us with a Directive that was worse than the one with which we started!

Where to from here?

Since that time, we have emptied our coffers (to the tune of some £15,000) paying for legal analysis of the ruling – primarily so we know exactly how to proceed with the case.



Dr. Robert Verkerk
Executive & Scientific Director of
the Alliance for Natural Health

We are confident that the case has brought three very important areas of clarification that will set important precedents for other laws affecting natural products and foods, as well as making it much easier to keep or put therapeutic nutritional supplements on the market.

The problem is that the changes brought about by the ECJ ruling will be ignored by Member States unless the necessary legal changes are made to the national laws (statutory instruments) which reflect the European directive.

Recently we discovered that the parties in the parallel case, the NAHS and the HFMA, whose case became joined with our own in the ECJ, have now pulled out. We can only assume they have lost the will to fight on or feel there is no value in doing so. This leaves us as the sole horse in the race, one that we are determined to see through.

Lone horse

We now need to return to the High Court in London to allow this Court to determine whether it agrees with our reasoning that the statutory instrument needs to be changed to reflect the clarification and narrowing of scope provided by the ruling. If the Court agrees with our assessment, the statutory instruments in the UK will need to be changed, and those of other European countries will be forced to follow suit.

We have written to the Court – and we await a date for hearing.

Persistence seems to be the key quality required in this battle. A very large number of consumers across Europe, as well as a healthy sprinkling of well-known journalists, have made clear their feelings about this directive. It is, put simply, a piece of bad law that needs some straightening.

To walk away now would be foolish. In my view, thinking of the future generations that will need to live under whatever regime becomes set in stone, to do so would also be negligent.

For further information, please contact the Alliance for Natural Health at The Atrium, Dorking, Surrey RX4 1HA, United Kingdom, visit www.anhcampaign.org or telephone 01252 371 275.

In brief:

The gains that ANH are now chasing:

1. Natural sources containing specific vitamins and minerals should not be legally controlled under this Directive. These products - such as wheat germ oil, cod liver oil and acerola cherries - are foods and so, legally, should be more properly viewed as foods, rather than as food supplements. Comprehensive laws already exist to protect consumers from unsafe foods.
2. The procedure to have nutrients added to the 'positive list' has been clearly specified and is greatly simplified compared with the procedure that was otherwise going to be put in place.
3. The primary onus for proving safety of ingredients is now with the regulator rather than the manufacturer.

In terms of the precedents created by these three areas, those of greatest immediate relevance are future provisions of the Directive that will be applied in an attempt to limit the maximum potencies of food supplements, and restrictions on forms other than vitamins and minerals (which are already covered), including herbal extracts or phytonutrients, amino acids, essential fatty acids, and other micro-nutrients, and the establishment of health claims for foods and food supplements.

Slow down and smell the roses

By Bob Hook

It has been said that “people do not care how much you know, until they know how much you care”. This, I feel, is very appropriate advice for every member of the Dr. Rath Health Alliance.

Each of us has a responsibility to share our knowledge of Cellular Medicine, and its benefits, with the general public. This is not always easy however, and in my experience one’s efforts can sometimes be met with doubt, scepticism, and disbelief.

To begin with, it is obviously important that we are able to describe the nutritional requirements of our bodies; outline the way in which our diet has changed compared to that of our forefathers; and explain how Cellular Medicine is of long-term benefit to everybody. We also need to be able to express how we, personally, have benefited from utilizing Cellular Medicine, and to show how we really believe that it will benefit others.

Undoubtedly however, one of the hardest parts in the promotion of anything is the feeling of being rejected personally, and having ones best intentions treated in a manner that is either hurtful or, in some cases, quite rude. We must all understand therefore that when this happens it is not “us” that is being rejected: it may be the idea, it may be the timing of our approach, it may just be that the person has had a bad day and that they will come back to us at a later time. In such a situation we should not get downhearted, and should try instead to leave the door open for the person come back for more information in the future.

Similarly, whilst talking to others, it is all too easy to con-

clude that if a person is not immediately convinced by the merits of Cellular Medicine, it is a “lose” situation. In my opinion however this is a somewhat short-sighted way of looking at things, and ignores the fact that a “win” can take many different forms.

Clearly, the best outcome is obviously that

Each of us has a responsibility to share our knowledge of Cellular Medicine, and its benefits, with the general public

your friend, neighbour, relative or work colleague will immediately want to obtain the benefit of bettering their life through using Cellular Medicine.

However, you can also “win” by their stating that they want ‘To think about it’. In such a situation they might go away, talk to someone else

about it, and then come back to you for further information.

Similarly, another form of “win” might be considered as being given permission to add the person to your mailing list, or consent for you to give them a call every now and again. One never knows when an illness or health problem may appear, and the possibility of an alternative to drugs and surgery is suddenly required.

synthetic chemicals that have not been proven long-term in the bodies of humans.

Finally, yet a further way to “win” is by making a friend. Yes, you never know when you are going to meet someone with whom you will build a friendship. Loneliness is a huge problem in today’s world, and friends are one of the most valued gifts that we can have. This world is moving faster and faster, and as such it is all too easy to lose control of our time, and the ability to ‘Slow down and smell the roses’. Having a friend may help you to take time-out, relax with a cuppa, and take stock of what you both consider important, both for now and the future.

Taking care of ourselves is vital, and from our bodies’ point of view is why we are part-takers of Cellular Medicine in the first place.

However we must also look at our ability to relax, to share time with those that matter to us, and to understand how our minds control us with not always with the results that we would wish. I shall be considering more on this subject in future issues. In the meantime however I wish you all success, and the very best of health.

Bob Hook is a motivator, counsellor, life-coach as well as a member of the Dr. Rath Health Alliance, and may be reached on 07899 921410.

