

Giving a Statement in the name of Science?



Notice: This information is not about the correctness or otherwise of any approach to wellbeing or health.

This is about the methodology by which Professor Bunce condemned a person in the name of science, about the logical consistency of his argumentation, and about the moral implications of his relevant actions.

I ask whether Professor Chris Bunce (shown) is fit to stand as a representative of the British medical science.

I ask whether the methodology that this academician applied as part of his contribution to a BBC West Inside Out programme broadcast on 14.01.2013 is fit to represent top British cancer science which claims to be dedicated to saving lives. The film introduced Prof Bunce in his role as the Research Director of Leukaemia & Lymphoma Research, now "Bloodwise".

His title calls him Professor of Experimental Haematological Oncology at the Birmingham University: he is Reviewing Editor for PLoS One and a regular Reviewer of Papers for Blood, Cancer Research, Leukaemia, British Journal of Haematology and others.

My fuller response to that film:

http://www.cathar.org.uk/data/articles/Dhaxem_and_Cancer.pdf

The film alleged to be exposing a charlatan healer charging £280 for recommending cabbage as a cancer cure. It claimed that I was that charlatan; but I believe that the real aim was to discredit me as a witness in connection with two Slovak deaths connected to the Gloucestershire Royal Hospital, which I am campaigning to see properly investigated, since summer 2011. The film makers have publicly demonstrated their interest in that matter by showing in the film a page which I have published on the internet as part of my campaign to bring those possibly responsible for shortcomings to justice. Articles on relevant events were made public in the EU since June 2011 and I gave an internet radio

talk lasting two hours earlier in 2013. A letter of December 2013 informs me that a complaint involving a registered nurse in a senior administrative position at the GRH will shortly be considered by a panel of the Investigating Committee. [Update 04.04.14: The case against the nurse, Gillian Denise Brook, was thrown out based on a lie, shortly before she was to stand before a tribunal. While investigated, she was promoted to Assistant Director Patient Experience at NHS England.]

My uncertainty about the methods applied by Prof Bunce focuses on that:

1. He undertook to comment in a manner which would destroy a person, their position and their reputation without asking for a proof of the allegations. In fact, he did not need a proof of whether the practice he seemed keen to comment on is at all in business, before proceeding to condemn a person alleged to be running it.
2. He condemned a person on evidence by a paid agent provocateur – which is unacceptable, because it can artificially produce a false image about something that may not be taking place under normal circumstances. It is not evidence; it is applying possible criminal means to maliciously harming a person who may be innocent.
3. He misinterpreted information he held in his hands (a recommended diet sheet for one month marked to a person, but not to a diagnosis and not claiming to be a cure of anything at all) while the person concerned was not given the opportunity to defend themselves, or to comment. It had been made to sound as if the sheet was presented as a finite alleged cancer cure, and the false notion was passed on to the media supported by his name together with the names of UK and international institutions connected in the film and in the media to the Professor.
4. He condemned an approach by applying criteria irrelevant to that approach. (Concerns raised included not giving advice in line with a lie presented by a sufferer who seemingly believed that he could not have cancer, and not taking into account an x-ray carried around by the apparent self-confessed cancer cheat, Chris Geiger.)
5. The possible relevance for humans of a result obtained by applying the approach with an animal had been ridiculed. By referring to the approach, it had effectively been implied that results achieved with animals are irrelevant and even dangerous to people.
6. His evaluation of the alleged practice seems to have culminated by him commenting on cabbage while using the words “very dangerous”. The Professor is someone who seemed to have suggested, and therefore presumably considered

safe, the possible use of an antidepressant, not for depression, but as a cancer treatment.

7. He emphatically condemned a person for suggesting to Geiger that cabbage juice (which is in the first instance as a source of Vitamin C of low acidity, in addition to its other properties) beats (his) cancer, while it had been implied that in the English language to “beat cancer” means “curing cancer”, which was a particularly malicious misrepresentation of the language. At around the same time papers claimed that metformin “beats cancer” and that testing “beats cancer”.

The message to a lay person from these pieces of information, if put together would be, that the Professor finds eating antidepressants to be safer, than consuming cabbage.

8. The Professor was shown a filmed recording of a two hour consultation that emphasised the principle that the body will reflect the person inside and that therefore, nurturing only pure thoughts and having at all times the best possible intent towards everyone, is the best and the only way to regaining and maintaining good health. The reporter asked Prof Bunce what he thinks of what he saw and the professor said he finds it “scary”.
9. When the reporter asked Prof Bunce what he thinks where Geiger would be, if he followed the advice, the Professor did not seem to deliberate too long before bringing up the possibility that Geiger could be dead.

I have been in academic work (social and business science). I understand that my highly unorthodox approach to wellbeing may be difficult to comprehend by others who never had, and cannot imagine, the experiences that I have as a normal part of my life; I well understand and even sympathise with possible apprehension and difficulties that some people might have when first presented with my statements but, if they straight forward assume that I am a liar and a cheat, I read that as a statement which they are making not about me, but about themselves. They extrapolate their own world onto me, and they presume in me what may be natural to them. My website www.dhaxem.com (attacked by the film) aims to offer insights and to inspire people. It also gives a couple of examples of results, but the main aim of the website is to explain the laws in the Cathar Testament.

The film contained irrelevant and inaccurate information about my alleged background. While it is true that I was born in a city which is since 1918 part of Slovakia, I am as “Slovakian born” as were the peers born in India “Indian born”. The apparent nationalistic slant chosen in the film complemented the negative picture created, and this invites the question to what extent may film have been also Nazi and, or racially/ethnically motivated?

The nurse in the senior administrative position whose investigation was stopped was previously employed in the Birmingham Children's Hospital. There had been the possibility of an association between the nurse and a Gloucester social worker Shireen Bhaiyat, who may have qualified from some institution possibly in Birmingham. (She gave the name of the accrediting body as the "University of Central Birmingham", while also seemingly unable to distinguish between aunts and cousins in an official social work report of 19th August 2009). In another report of October 2009 on behalf of the Gloucester City Council on the last line of page 9 and the first line on page 10 that social worker has made a remark which seemed to differentiate between a group from Slovakia and others in society. It stated: "...the (Slovak) family may have an inherent distrust of agencies that represent the rest of the population." I registered that remark with Nigel Roberts, Director of Law and Administration at the GCC, with my letter to him of 13.01.2010 to which his office responded within 24 hours. The social worker, as well as the nurse in a senior administrative position, they both were connected to one of the two Slovak people whose deaths concern me. They both appeared to have insisted on using in the role of a Slovak interpreter a Miss Suchankova, a 23 years old Czech speaking person possibly unsure of her real name and possibly unable to properly as much as understand Slovak, who may not have had a CRB, whose English had an American accent, and by whom one of the two people whose deaths concern me seemed to have felt abused, and that person died from self-harm associated with stress. His small children were watching as their father collapsed in a pool of blood on the 19.12.2011 under the Christmas tree. The father died later that day in the hospital and the children took the Christmas tree down the next morning.

I believe that the film was made to eliminate me as a witness and to prevent a possible investigation of the wider circumstances under which the two people died. The extreme lies which the film contained, most notably, the claim that a person who died receiving chemotherapy four years after I last saw them died during my treatment, I believe, were aimed at stirring up an angry mob to attacking and possibly killing me. To that end the film has shown the access to the house where I live, all sides and all windows and doors in detailed shots. I believe that the film constituted a criminal act, an enticement to my murder.

The fate of all those who participated will show how far God approved of the film and what he thinks of the cover up.

Corascendea Cathar

31.12.2013

27.01.2017: http://www.cathar.org.uk/data/articles/Four_years_on.pdf