

Re: laetrile

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.nutrition/2007-02/msg00574.html>

- *From:* "Jeff" <news@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 21 Feb 2007 17:07:58 GMT
-

"TC" <tunderbar@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1172071235.209349.104910@xx

On Feb 20, 6:44 pm, "Jeff" <n...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"TC" <tunder...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:1172007809.399244.117300@xx

> On Feb 20, 3:28 pm, "TC" <tunder...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>> On Feb 16, 11:36 pm, "Jeff" <n...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>>> <capm...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

>>> [news:45d636e3\\$0\\$259\\$1c4686b2@xx](mailto:news:45d636e3$0$259$1c4686b2@xx)

>>>> "You would think that ANY possible treatments for such a condition
>>>> as
>>>> CANCER would have been thoroughly studied, inside and out, until
>>>> there
>>>> was no doubt about its efficacy, one way or another. Especially >>>
> with
>>>> the
>>>> extremely limited treatment options available and their not
>>>> altogether
>>>> stellar results.

>>>> For any such possible treatment to NOT have been thoroughly
>>>> investigated
>>>> is bloody criminal."

>>>> The results in the post are those from the advocates which showed
>>>> they
>>>> were crap research. Valid scientific studies were done seperatly >>>

Re: laetrile

> and
>>>> when the first few showed no effect at all no more were done. If >>>>
> you
>>>> declare that picking your nose cures cancer and one well done >>>>
> studie
>>>> shows it doesn't, nothingmore need be done.

>>> I beg to differ. Not only was did Laetrile not help, it was also
>>> harmful to
>>> some.

>>> So when there was an effect, it was negative.

>>> Jeff

>> Why do you trolls always talk about the science being so clear and
>> concise but you never, ever, EVER, back it up with actual links or
>> cites? You know why? Because you are useless trolls more interested in
>> making noise than providing provable facts.

>> TC– Hide quoted text –

>> – Show quoted text –

> Hey Jeff, is this one of those studies you were talking about?

><http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?db=pubmed&cmd=Retrieve...>

> Moertel CG, Fleming TR, Rubin J, Kvols LK, Sarna G, Koch R, Currie VE.

> Young CW, Jones SE, Davignon JP.

> One hundred seventy-eight patients with cancer were treated with
> amygdalin (Laetrile) plus a "metabolic therapy" program consisting of
> diet, enzymes, and vitamins. The great majority of these patients were
> in good general condition before treatment. None was totally disabled
> or in preterminal condition. One third had not received any previous
> chemotherapy. The pharmaceutical preparations of amygdalin, the
> dosage, and the schedule were representative of past and present
> Laetrile practice. No substantive benefit was observed in terms of
> cure, improvement or stabilization of cancer, improvement of symptoms
> related to cancer, or extension of life span. The hazards of amygdalin
> therapy were evidenced in several patients by symptoms of cyanide
> toxicity or by blood cyanide levels approaching the lethal range.
> Patients exposed to this agent should be instructed about the danger
> of cyanide poisoning, and their blood cyanide levels should be
> carefully monitored. Amygdalin (Laetrile) is a toxic drug that is not
> effective as a cancer treatment.

> One of the authors:

> Thomas Fleming, Ph.D., Professor and Chairman, Department of

Re: laetrile

> Biostatistics, University of Washington, Seattle. Receives between
> \$10,000 and \$50,001 in consulting fees from GlaxoSmithKline and
> receives less than \$10,001 per year from each of four of its
> competitors. ([http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/ac/02/transcripts/](http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/ac/02/transcripts/3848T1.htm)
> 3848T1.htm; accessed 2/23/05) Fleming received a consulting fee for a
> limited consultation with Boehringer-Ingelheim. (Circulation,
> 2004;109:e9004-5) Served on oncology Clinical Advisory Board for
> Sunesis. ("Sunesis Begins Phase I Clinical Study of SNS-595 for
> Cancer; Prestigious Oncology Clinical Advisory Board Established," PR
> Newswire, 6/28/04) Speaker on IntraBiotics' live web cast featuring a
> panel of experts to discuss iseganan for the treatment of oral
> mucositis. ("IntraBiotics to Host a Conference Call and Web Cast with
> a Panel of Experts," PR NewsWire, 3/18/02)

> ****

> The fact that he works for Glaxo, and Sunesis, and IntraBiotics kinda
> messes with his appearance of being a professional and credible
> "independent" researcher, doesn't it?

He was not the only researcher who conducted the study, was he?

Can you provide evidence that Laetrile works?

Jeff

He was one of the researchers. We don't know if he took a leadership role, do we? And he failed to declare conflicts didn't he? That, by itself, raises a red flag.

What conflicts was he required to declare and to whom?

You kinda missed the point there, buddy. I do not have evidence that laetrile works. I am not saying that Laetrile works. What I am saying is that these so-called scientists don't have any evidence that it does not work.

First, please give a rationale on why you think it should work? Does it interrupt a metabolic pathway required for cancer cell survival? Does it enhance the immune system so that it can seek and destroy cancer cells?

It has been suggested that industry can't be trusted because they have conflicts of interest. What makes you think that the proponents of this are more trustworthy? Some operate for-profit clinics in Mexico.

And they are prepared to make scientific claims on Laetrile effectiveness in the absence of any properly conducted randomized trials. Instead of making statements about the lack of

Re: laetrile

Re: laetrile

evidence to support laetrile, they should be either recommending proper trials or conducting the trials.

Why? Because some quack says it works so he could make more money?

The few studies that have been found suggest there is no benefit. Why do you think that more money should be wasted on this?

You cannot declare that a substance is effective or not effective in the ABSENCE of data. You can declare that there is no acceptable clinically tested evidence to support its effectiveness or lack of it. but you cannot declare it effective or not effective.

There is no evidence to suggest that it is effective and evidence to suggest that it isn't effective.

<http://www.nlm.nih.gov/medlineplus/druginfo/natural/patient-bitteralmond.html>

<http://www.quackwatch.org/01QuackeryRelatedTopics/Cancer/laetrile.html>

I am not wasting my time on this anymore unless you can actually suggest a reason why we should continue studies on this quackery.

Jeff

TC