



Exposed!

How big pharma's "little white lies" are putting you in grave danger

And 5 critical steps for separating scientific fact from media-hyped fiction

It takes a lot to make a great big business like big pharma. You have to influence the scientific and medical establishments. You have to lobby government regulators like the FDA. And you have to persuade the media.

One key way big pharma does all this is by controlling the research. Either by sponsoring studies themselves and/or by manipulating how the findings are presented.

That's right—many of the supposedly "unbiased" scientific studies you read about in the lame-stream media are actually rigged in favor of the drugs big pharma peddles.

How does big pharma get away with this? First of all, the media rarely has the initiative (let alone the competence) to really dig into scientific data. So they often rely on press releases—issued by none other than the pharmaceutical companies themselves.

Secondly, most doctors don't have the time to read pages and pages of new scientific research. In fact, a 2001 American Medical Association membership survey revealed that a whopping 91 percent of all doctors

do not get their current information from medical journals. Instead, they rely on drug company salespeople to deliver the latest scientific "news."

So more often than not, a doctor can be counted on to parrot the latest spin from big pharma when it comes to your health.

And if that weren't troubling enough, dozens of pharmaceutical companies even sponsor nonprofit front groups like Research!America.¹ These groups lobby for more government funding for studies that—you guessed it—supply basic research for big pharma. All while purportedly representing the interests of the citizens.

And, unfortunately, these aren't the only underhanded tactics big pharma uses to influence public perception.

7 more tricks big pharma has up its sleeve

At the turn of the 20th century, Frank Norris published *The Octopus*, about the monopoly over wheat production and distribution by the railroads. A few years later, Upton Sinclair published *The Jungle* about the practices of the meatpacking industry. These two "muck-rucking"

exposés about our daily meat and bread, motivated President Theodore Roosevelt to exercise reforms, including the 1906 Pure Food and Drug Act, which became today's FDA.

One hundred years later, the Octopus has become big pharma, extending its tentacles into every aspect of "public health": the medical profession, the Congressional and Executive Branches of government (by way

Continued on page 2...

In this issue:

Sports drinks a flaming failure for your health 4

FDA guidelines and faulty research obscure vitamin E's true healing potential 5

Researchers discover the future of probiotics—in a traditional African tribe 7

Marc S. Micozzi, M.D., Ph.D., is a worldwide leader in nutritional and complementary/alternative medicine. He has had a distinguished career as a researcher and physician executive at the National Institutes of Health and Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in Washington, DC, and the College of Physicians in Philadelphia PA. He has published over 30 medical and trade books, and founded and edited the first scientific journal, and the first textbook, on complementary/alternative and nutritional medicine, now going into a 5th edition (2014) and continuously in print since 1995.

Dr. Micozzi's *Insiders' Cures* is published monthly by OmniVista Health Media, L.L.C., 819 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21201 for \$74 per year (\$6.16 an issue).

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Insiders' Cures*, 819 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21201.

Author: Marc S. Micozzi, M.D., Ph.D.
 Publisher: Katherine Wheeler
 Executive Editor: Amanda Angelini

All material in this publication is provided for information only and may not be construed as medical advice or instruction. No action should be taken based solely on the contents of this publication; readers should consult appropriate health professionals on any matter relating to their health and well-being. The information provided in this publication is believed to be accurate and sound, based on the best judgment available to the authors, but readers who fail to consult with appropriate health authorities assume the risk of any injuries. The opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the publisher. The publisher is not responsible for errors or omissions.

For questions regarding your subscription, please call reader services at 443-353-4398 (8 a.m. to 8 p.m. EDT Mon.-Fri.)

Copyright © 2014 OmniVista Health Media, L.L.C., 819 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21201. Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without written permission of the publisher.

of legions of high-paid lobbyists and the FDA, respectively), and the medical and mainstream media.

Especially the media.

You see, big pharma employs a legion of medical writers, many of them freelancers, to prepare and present their bidding to the public. I was invited by the American Medical Writers Association to give the keynote speech at their annual convention in Atlanta on my 40th birthday. I spoke about the importance of history in understanding the status of health and medicine today. But it seemed to me that the majority of the work available for “medical writers” was from big pharma.

So, here are some of the dirty tricks big pharma uses to present “new medical information” to the public...

Telling only part of the story.

Nearly one-third of all clinical drug trials are never made public—often because the research actually shows that the drugs either don't work or have serious side effects.² Tamiflu is a perfect example. A whopping 90 percent of the studies on this toxic flu drug were never published (see the *Daily Dispatch* “The game is over for Roche and Tamiflu”^{*} for more).

Disguising marketing as research. Big pharma likes to brag about how much of its budget is spent on research and development. Of course, pharmaceutical companies have been known to disguise marketing schemes as legitimate scientific drug studies.

A notorious example is the “research” behind Vioxx, the deadly arthritis drug manufactured by Merck, one of the biggest of the big pharma companies. Merck's *marketing division* actually conducted the so-called scientific

study that was given to doctors to prove the drug was safe.³

No wonder Vioxx turned out to be a deadly disaster.

Ghostwriting. Even when a legitimate study is presented as “independent,” it may actually be conducted by drug companies and then published under a doctor's name.

But what about university-published research?

Big pharma, as well as the chemical industry and the food industry, all fund many public and private universities. This money goes toward everything from university-wide endowments to research labs and positions. (To follow this money trail even further, refer back to the *Daily Dispatch* “A sad state of scientific affairs.”^{*}) Rampant conflicts of interest are common in today's corrupt higher education university system. So it's hardly a surprise when these “independent” university researchers publish studies in big pharma's favor.

Using only “perfect” study participants. The design of some so-called “gold-standard” clinical drug trials routinely excludes participants who may be most at risk for dangerous side effects. Plus, it regularly includes only those people who are most likely to show some benefit from the drug.

This practice helps explain why so many drugs are found to be toxic only after they are approved by the FDA and released upon millions of unsuspecting people.

And you probably won't be shocked to hear that many side effects only get revealed when a drug's patent is about to expire. Case in point: Ambien. In 2013,

a government agency reported that this sleeping pill was sending record numbers of people to the emergency room.⁴ The report came out *11 years* after the FDA approved Ambien.

The “perfect person” trick is also used for some studies on nutrients and dietary supplements. Researchers only choose people who are optimally nourished to begin with. So of course the nutrient or supplement shows little effect on these already healthy people. And big pharma certainly makes sure you hear about these sorts of results—or lack thereof—from the media.

Dosing flaws. Speaking of research on dietary supplements, researchers often insist on using the woefully inadequate government “recommended” doses in their studies. No surprise—the research subsequently concludes the supplements don’t work.

An example: In 2013, the *Annals of Internal Medicine* published an editorial titled “Enough Is Enough: Stop Wasting Money on Vitamin and Mineral Supplements.”⁵ This blanket dismissal was based on only three studies that used ridiculously low doses, not to mention pathetic, poor-quality big pharma daily multivitamins. (See the vitamin E feature on page 5 for another example.)

As I’ve emphasized many times before, dietary supplements are designed to *supplement a reasonably well-balanced diet*. Yet many studies don’t even bother to determine the diet and nutritional status of study participants in the first place. Other studies are based on imaginary dietary intakes determined by wholly inadequate research methods like dietary recalls, and dietary surveys. (And, with apologies to Philip K. Dick and Arnold Schwarzenegger,

these methods are far from “total recall.”)

As I explained back in July 2012 (in the *Daily Dispatch* “Garbage in, garbage out”), these research methods are totally inadequate. And the NIH has known about this “dietary deficiency” in their research for decades. But the careerist nutritional statisticians in charge of this garbage are apparently too threatened to have anyone around who really knows anything about human biology, diet, and nutrition. And, sadly, this problem extends to the government agency in charge of investigating nutritional and natural approaches—the National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine, or NCCAM. (See the October 15, 2012 *Daily Dispatch* “NCCAM fails at most basic mission.”*).

Rushing the research. Many studies are designed for only short periods of time—not long enough for permanent drug damage to emerge. And often not long enough to observe the full benefits of diet, nutrition, and dietary supplements.

Cherry-picking the data. A study can reach multiple conclusions, but big pharma press releases typically only highlight the most positive findings. Or there might be dueling studies, and only the one that best suits the pre-established agenda gets the attention of the media.

For instance, a 2013 study of only six people (and some lab rats) proclaimed that eating red meat may lead to heart disease.⁶ Meanwhile, a much larger study showed the exact opposite.⁷ Guess which study got the headlines?

Probably the single worst example of all of the above tricks was a 2013 study proclaiming that not only does fish oil do nothing for your heart,

but it also causes cancer. Those of us who really know the truth could only shake our heads. (See “What you REALLY need to know about fish, omega-3s, and prostate cancer risk” in the October 2013 issue of *Insiders’ Cures*.*)

Of course, considering big pharma spends an astounding \$27 billion a year to promote its drugs, it’s no wonder that we’re barraged with “research” that is questionable at best—and unconscionable at worst.⁸

5 steps for separating scientific fact from big pharma fiction

So how do you know if a study is truly reliable?

Well, there are a few things you should always watch out for when it comes to reading the popular headlines:

1. Who is paying for the study?

If it’s not disclosed in the article, beware.

2. Is it just an epidemiological-statistical study?

Or are some real doctors and clinical observations involved?

Epidemiological studies are designed to examine associations within a population. They can never prove causation in an individual.

3. Is there a lot of “number crunching” involved in presenting the data?

Or can the results be stated in simple terms? As Mark Twain oft quoted, “There are three kinds of lies: lies, damned lies and statistics.”

4. Is the reporter writing about the study a qualified science journalist?

They seem to be a dying breed. But there are still a few at the better papers and news channels.

Continued on page 4...

5. Are the “experts” being quoted actually qualified? This deficiency is often a real problem when it comes to reporting on alternative, complementary, and natural-medicine topics. Beware of regular physicians who have just “discovered” truths about

nutrition and natural healing that would have been known to anthropologists and biologists for decades.

And of course, at the end of the day, you can always just stick with me. I'll separate the scientific facts from big pharma's fiction for you

and show you what you *really* need to know for good health. **TC**

* *Previous Daily Dispatches and issues of Insiders' Cures can be downloaded for free on my website, www.drMicozzi.com.*

Citations available online at www.DrMicozzi.com

Sports drinks a flaming failure for your health

Did you see the recent news about putting out another fire... retardant? This time, the particular flame-fighting chemical making headlines isn't found in cigarettes or in children's pajamas and playthings. Believe it or not, it has been hiding out in popular sports drinks.

The culprit is brominated vegetable oil (BVO). Beverage manufacturers add it to sports drinks to help keep the artificial flavors from separating. But before the drink manufacturers got hold of it, this toxin was originally patented by chemical companies as a fire retardant.

BVO made news recently because it's finally being removed from Powerade, after being taken out of Gatorade last year. So that's one kind of “fire in the belly” these drinks won't be putting out for athletes anymore.

It is bad enough to drink any kind of vegetable oil. But brominated vegetable oil contains bromine, which is chemically similar to the chlorine put in swimming pools to kill every living thing.

Scientists have been concerned about brominated and chlorinated chemicals polluting our environment and water supplies for decades. And now they're finally concerned about it polluting our bodies too.

Animal studies show that BVO can increase cholesterol and behavioral and reproductive problems.^{1,2} In humans, BVO appears to build up in the tissues, and has been linked to headache, fatigue, and memory loss.³

Not exactly what you are looking for in a “performance” drink, is it?

Unfortunately, BVO isn't the only thing you should be worried about in sports drinks. These toxic concoctions that are relentlessly foisted on the public—purportedly to keep us hydrated and healthy during strenuous physical activity—are loaded with calories, sugar, and other empty carbohydrates.

Sugar rush

Along with toxic chemicals, sports drinks are also packed with sugar to give you a temporary “high.” Unfortunately, that temporary high can lead to one that lasts much longer—in the form of high, unbalanced blood sugar. Which, as you know, can lead to diabetes.

In the long run, the sugar and other carbs found in sports drinks are good only as a source of calories. And unless you're an Olympic athlete, chances are you're not going to burn off those extra calories safely.

Believe it or not, one of the “best” options—and yes, I mean that

very ironically—is Mountain Dew Kickstart, with 20 grams of carbs (19 grams sugar) and 80 calories per 16 oz. serving. Of course, the only reason it ranks this “low” is that it also contains the artificial sweetener sucralose—in addition to high fructose corn syrup. I can't say this discovery surprised me much. My one and only experience with Mountain Dew (soda) many years ago was equally disturbing...

Following a full day of work, I traveled to the Carolinas to give a series of talks and arrived late and hungry. The only available meal was at some fast food joint. Wanting to avoid the caffeine in colas, I ordered the only non-cola available—Mountain Dew. I'd never had it before, and couldn't understand why I was up all night. Growing desperate for sleep, I read the entire autobiography of H.R. Haldeman (one of President Nixon's “four horsemen of the apocalypse”). Not even that put me to sleep. Later, I found that Mountain Dew has twice the caffeine as the typical cola!

But, I digress...

Here are some other common sports drinks and their calorie and carb breakdowns:

- All Sport, 20 oz.—150 calories, 40 grams of carbs (all sugar)


- Gatorade, 12 oz.—80 calories, 21 grams of carbs (all sugar)
- Powerade, 12 oz.—80 calories, 22 grams of carbs (21 grams sugar)

But toxins and excess sugar aside, are these sports drinks at least hydrating you?

Wet your whistle

One of the great myths is that all you need to drink is fluids and electrolytes. While this approach (without all the chemical additives in sports drinks) can help with the hydration in your blood and extracellular fluids, your *cells* must make most of their own water in order to be truly hydrated.

Carbs provide the fuel for cellular hydration, but your cells still need help stoking the fire. Nutrients like coenzyme-Q10 (ubiquinol) and South African rooibos (red bush) are two good ways to keep your cellular fires burning.

Now that the hot weather is here, it's especially important to pay attention to healthy hydration. Of course, I recommend Red Joe brand water-soluble rooibos extract, which I helped develop. It's an easy and delicious way to stay hydrated at the cellular level. And it's a lot healthier than a sports drink spiked with sugar and fire retardants. 

Citations available online at www.DrMicozzi.com

The hidden cause of chronic cough

Chronic cough can be a serious problem for some people. Doctors usually ascribe chronic cough to postnasal drip, allergies, asthma, or acid reflux.

But dehydration is often overlooked as a cause. And yet, chronic cough can occur when your respiratory passages are not moist enough. Drinking plenty of healthy fluids will keep those passages hydrated and help stop the hacking.

FDA guidelines and faulty research obscure vitamin E's true healing potential

New stories are sounding off in the medical and the mainstream media about some important topics for your health. When heard in isolation, they sound only like random gun blasts popping off in the distance. But when you listen to them together they often carry a tune.

This situation is particularly true when it comes to vitamin E.

Last month, I reported on how the new FDA dietary supplement labeling guidelines could be a disaster for anyone who values good health (see the article “BEWARE the FDA ‘s latest plan to ‘help’ dietary supplement consumers” in the June 2014 issue of *Insiders' Cures*.*)

And in the case of vitamin E, these guidelines simply serve to perpetuate (and perpetrate on an unsuspecting public) mainstream medicine's failure to understand what this

essential nutrient really is and how it really works.

This persistent ignorance also allows the mainstream to mount renewed attacks on vitamin E. One of the most ridiculous is a new report that this nutritional powerhouse supposedly contributes to prostate cancer risk. I'll talk more about this misunderstanding in just a moment. And I'll also share some new research on vitamin E's role in brain health—about which mainstream medicine remains absolutely clueless.

Before I get to that, it's important to note that when it comes to vitamin E, the toxic trifecta of the FDA, mainstream medicine, and big pharma have come together in a perfect storm of nutritional ignorance. And, as usual, it is honest, taxpaying citizens who are at risk of being abandoned at sea.

But, today I'll throw you the life

preserver, launch the life boat, and together we'll set sail on a new course out of these stormy seas.

E-rroneous FDA

First of all, the FDA still needs a lot of lessons in the basic science of human diet, nutrition, and dietary supplementation. As you know, they are way off base with their new rules regarding folate (vitamin B9) and other key nutrients (again, see the article “BEWARE the FDA ‘s latest plan to ‘help’ dietary supplement consumers” in last month's issue of *Insiders' Cures**).

But vitamin E remains a fundamental problem for them—and consequently for you.

There are eight different active compounds that make up vitamin E—four tocopherols (alpha, beta, delta, and gamma) and four

Continued on page 6...

tocotrienols (also called alpha, beta, delta, and gamma). But “it’s all Greek” (literally) to the boys in the FDA fraternity. They don’t even recognize seven of these vitamin E compounds.

According to the FDA, the only “active” vitamin E compound is alpha-tocopherol.

This nutrient is the so-called vitamin E that is most often used in studies. But considering the vitamin E you get from foods, like nuts, seeds, spinach, and broccoli, contains all eight active compounds, why would you trust any study that only uses *one* of those compounds?

And yet, that’s exactly what happened recently. Researchers reported that taking an “FDA-approved” synthetic alpha-tocopherol form of vitamin E appeared to slightly increase the risk of prostate cancer.¹

Since the body normally consumes natural mixtures of all eight forms

of vitamin E, giving only synthetic alpha-tocopherol in a study creates a completely unnatural, unbalanced set of nutritional circumstances.

Thirty years ago, the world witnessed (as I had warned in advance) how giving an isolated, synthetic beta-carotene capsule (without the normal, natural mixtures of all carotenoids in foods) actually increased the risk of lung cancer among people at higher risk. (You can read more about this story in the special report *Classified Cancer Answers*.*) Now history appears to be repeating itself with vitamin E and prostate cancer.

This approach employs the kind of ill logic that Seattle researchers used last year when they associated fish oil with prostate cancer risk in men. (A ridiculous conclusion I thoroughly debunked in the October 2013 issue of *Insiders' Cures*.*) And now the infamous VITAL study is trying to

do the same thing with fish oil and endometrial cancer in women.²

Like this new vitamin E/prostate cancer study, both of these trials failed to pay attention to important details. And, as the saying goes, the devil is in the details.

The real conclusion the vitamin E researchers should have found is that ingesting an artificial, incomplete, isolated, unbalanced, and unnatural form of vitamin E may actually disrupt the nutrient metabolism that helps the body fight prostate cancer.

But this finding isn’t the only way the FDA’s vitamin E ignorance is failing your health...

The sum of its parts

The FDA’s sole focus on alpha-tocopherol also ignores all the tocotrienols. But these vitamin E compounds actually appear to be more mobile in the body among cells and to have greater benefits.

Real prostate protection—straight from the supermarket

For decades, the government-industrial-medical complex has been spending millions of taxpayer dollars to study isolated, synthetic, incomplete nutrients for prostate health in men. Meanwhile, there is plenty of impressive evidence that already exists for the role of saw palmetto, stinging nettle, and zinc in prostate health. And of course, there’s also lycopene—a carotenoid that really does work.

In fact, I was part of the research team that discovered the importance of lycopene in human metabolism and nutrition in the mid-1980s—while the National Cancer Institute was busy barking up the beta-carotene tree.

Lycopene is the carotenoid pigment responsible for the red and pink colors in tomatoes, grapefruit, guava, and watermelon. My own early studies showed that lycopene is most bioavailable when consumed in a cooked, concentrated form, such as ketchup, tomato sauce or tomato paste (as compared to eating raw fruits or tomatoes). This observation has since been confirmed by multiple studies.

Both blood and tissue levels of lycopene are lower in men with aggressive prostate cancer compared to those with less aggressive, “occult” prostate tumors.

Of course, I have pointed out before that these less aggressive cases should not even be classified as “cancer” at all. In fact, they are a major contributor to overdiagnosis and overtreatment in today’s cancer industry (see the *Daily Dispatch* “Overdiagnosis can become a bigger problem than some cancers”).

But the bottom line is that lycopene protects against real prostate cancer.

In fact, reams of research show that vitamin E tocotrienols are among the most important nutrients for preventing everything from cancer to dementia. And gamma-tocotrienol may actually be the single most important form of vitamin E for health. But you won't hear that from the FDA.

Instead, along with all the other tocotrienols, this form is totally ignored by the FDA and considered to be completely "inactive."

Meanwhile, researchers have found that people who have high levels of tocotrienols in their blood have a lower risk of cognitive impairment—including Alzheimer's disease.³

And a new study shows that a daily

dose of 2,000 IU of natural mixed vitamin E slows progression of mild to moderate Alzheimer's disease by 20 percent a year. (A level which has struck some awestruck observers as "high"—but only because RDA's are so ridiculously low to begin with.) Meanwhile, the study participants who took FDA-approved Alzheimer's drugs not only got no benefits, but actually had higher incidences of serious side effects like infections.⁴ And taking the drug actually appeared to negate the benefits of taking vitamin E.

Tocotrienols also appear to help prevent cancer (including prostate cancer), as well as cardiovascular disease.^{5,6}

So what have we learned from today's tour through vitamin E, nutrition, and brain and prostate health? All it takes is some real knowledge of human diet and nutrition to make sense of the isolated bits and pieces from today's often incoherent medical research.

Just don't look to the FDA or the mainstream government-industrial-medical complex to provide that knowledge or guidance. **IC**

* *All previous Daily Dispatches, back issues, and new-subscriber bonus reports can be downloaded for free by logging in to the Subscriber area of www.drMicozzi.com.*

Citations available online at www.DrMicozzi.com

Researchers discover the future of probiotics— in a traditional African tribe

As you know, there is something that always bothered me about attempts to "restore" normal gut bacteria (microbiome) with probiotic supplements. While western medicine has come to realize that the intestinal microbiome is responsible for many aspects of human health and nutrition, they have one big problem: Nobody really has any idea what "normal" gut bacteria are! So the "natural know-it-alls" who recommend probiotic supplements don't have a true basis for their recommendations. (See the article "Microscopic bugs may hold the secret to..." in the January 2013 issue of *Insiders' Cures*.*)

But now, for the first time ever, a group of German scientists studied the gut microbiome of a traditional hunter-gatherer society—the Hazda people of Tanzania, Africa. And they made some discoveries that will change everything you thought you

knew about probiotics.

Of course, before I get to those groundbreaking insights, I can't help but point out, once again, that these important revelations didn't come from the hallowed halls of the U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH).

There, they seem to have three major requirements for "leading" research in nutritional medicine and natural approaches: (1) that you have no background whatsoever in nutrition or in a relevant field, (2) that you have failed at whatever field of science you were supposed to be good at, and (3) you are a government bureaucrat that they can never get rid of, but don't want you working on anything they really care about at NIH (namely, research on drug development and invasive procedures).

But in Germany, anthropologists, ecologists, biologists, and analytical

chemists work together to further understanding of human nutrition. And they take a real approach to science. They understand that for every laboratory-based scientist, they need three other scientists who know how to work outside the laboratory—in the real world, surrounded by the Nature they are studying.

The Max Planck Institute in Leipzig, Germany, is one such place. Max Planck was actually one of the founders of quantum physics in the early 20th century. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics and is known for the all-important "Planck constant" (which relates the energy of electro-magnetic radiation to its wavelength).

But real science knows no bounds. And the institute named

Continued on page 8...

after Planck isn't limited to studying quantum physics. Instead, the researchers at the Planck Institute take a truly scientific approach to understanding the world as a whole—including human health. (And they have maintained their ties to Tanzania, formerly known as German East Africa, for those who have seen John Huston's "The African Queen.")

Modern living leads to a less diverse microbiome—and more disease

These scientists had the wisdom to understand that the western diet has become so homogenous and deviant from natural human dietary experiences, it no longer can give an accurate window into the "normal" microbiome. So the Max Planck researchers traveled thousands of miles to Tanzania to find a population whose lifestyle—and microbiome—is closer to that of our ancestors.

And, in fact, they discovered that the Hazda people harbor a unique microbiome pattern with features never before seen in any human group. This "original" microbiome shows far more diversity among the different kinds of probiotic bacteria compared to the limited range of probiotics in modern microbiomes, or so-called probiotic supplements.

Low microbiome bacterial diversity is associated with several increasingly common diseases in western populations, including colon cancer, diabetes, irritable bowel syndrome, and ulcerative colitis.

Also, for the first time, the Max Planck scientists observed a difference between the microbiomes of men and women. The female microbiome appears more adapted to normal reproductive and hormonal functions. As I've mentioned before, these reproductive and hormonal factors are the real keys in determining women's risk of breast cancer. So perhaps there

really is a link between breast cancer and diet after all—although National Cancer Institute (NCI) research has been looking in all the wrong places (see my report *Classified Cancer Answers**).

Of course, while I was a scientist at NCI 25 years ago, some of my colleagues and I performed an analysis on the largest research data base then available. We found a clear connection between intestinal function and breast cancer. This finding was published in the *American Journal of Public Health*. Yet our political bosses at NCI told us to discontinue this line of work because it was based on the idea there was a connection to the gut microbiome, which they considered a "discounted" theory from early 20th century naturopathic medicine.

But, as this new research on the Hazda people shows, the microbiome connection to disease is anything but a "discounted theory."

So what do these new findings mean for you?

Balance your microbiome naturally

Well, first of all, the work of the Max Planck scientists raises an important question for all of us. How can natural-know-it-alls, or clueless natural products manufacturers, offer any so-called "probiotic" supplement to "normalize" the natural human gut microbiome when they have no idea what "normal" really is?

(It's like the problem with vitamin K supplements, which I discussed in the May issue.*)

For instance, the Hazda people have high levels of some probiotics that are considered "unhealthy" by western doctors and low levels of some probiotics that are considered "healthy" here.

Another important take-away lesson

from this new research? No single-strain probiotic supplement (like acidophilus) can be effective because the body naturally needs a mixture of probiotics.


So, with these two lessons in mind, beware taking probiotic supplements.

It's best to support your microbiome the way the Hazda people do—and the way our ancestors always did: by eating healthy foods.

There are several food sources of healthy bacteria (probiotics) in foods that, when eaten regularly, can help keep your microbiome balanced.

Yogurt and cheese are two of the easiest to find. But raw milk may be even more effective—if you can get it. Unfortunately, raw milk is forbidden by many nanny state governments. To find a source near you, visit www.realmilk.com.

Traditionally cultured foods like sauerkraut or Korean kim chi are also good dietary sources of probiotics. Soy sauces and fish sauces and pastes from East and Southeast Asia are other good food sources of probiotics. Even home-brewed beer and wine can be a good, natural source of probiotics—as long as they haven't been pasteurized. (Plus, you get the benefits of moderate alcohol consumption.)

In addition to these probiotic foods which introduce and help maintain healthy microbes, there are also some foods that can help nurture the normal microbiome itself. Artichoke, barley, beans, green, leafy vegetables, and oats all naturally promote and support the growth of "good" bacteria that are already present in the GI tract. 

* *Previous issues of Insiders' Cures and new-subscriber special bonus reports can be downloaded for free by logging in to the Subscriber section of my website, www.drMicozzi.com*