

Medical Thermography

Discover a safe alternative to mammography and prevent cancer – naturally

By Jonathan Landsman, Natural News



Has your family doctor or GYN ever talked to you about "breast thermography"? This is a simple, non-invasive way of accessing your risk for breast cancer - yet most conventionally-trained physicians have no idea about its benefits. Although a surprising fact to most people, medical thermography has been around since the 1970's and approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in 1982 for breast cancer detection and risk assessment - as an adjunct to mammography.

Unfortunately, the medical establishment; the American Cancer Society (ACS) and most women's organizations only push for mammography - which, due to radiation exposure, only increases your risk for breast cancer with every test. Find out how to prevent breast cancer - years before conventional testing procedures - by understanding the value of breast thermography and natural healthcare solutions.

What is the difference between mammography and thermography?

According to Moshe Dekel, M.D., board certified in GYN and a specialist in breast thermography - "the difference between the two modalities is profound."

"Mammography, like MRI and sonography, is an anatomical study; it looks at anatomical changes of the breast tissue. It may take up to ten years for the tumor to grow to a sufficient size to be detectable by either a mammogram or a physical examination. By that time, the tumor has achieved more than 25 doublings of the malignant cell colony and may have already metastasized."

Do we really want to wait that long? And, do we really want to expose ourselves to all that

radiation?

Dr. Dekel goes on to say, "thermography is a physiological study. The infrared camera detects the heat (infrared radiation), which is emitted by the breast without physical contact with it (no compression) and without sending any signal (no radiation)."

"Thermography shows small, unilateral temperature increases, which are caused by an increased blood supply to [cancer](#) cells. Cancer cells have an ability to create new blood vessels to the affected area (neovascularization) in order to satisfy the increased demand for nutrients resulting from the higher rate of growth and metabolic demands of the new colony."

Scientific proof that [mammograms](#) are ineffective at preventing breast cancer

Back in 2000, a large, long-term Canadian study found that an annual mammogram was no more effective in preventing deaths from breast cancer than periodic physical examinations for women in their 50's. Half of the almost 40,000 women, ages 50 to 59, received periodic breast examinations alone and half received breast examinations plus mammograms. All learned to examine their own breasts as well.

By 1993, 13 years after the study began, there were 610 cases of invasive [breast cancer](#) and 105 deaths in the women who received only breast examinations, compared with 622 invasive breast cancers and 107 deaths in those who received breast examinations and mammograms.

Let's be honest - mammograms do more harm, than good. Their ionizing radiation mutates cells, and the mechanical pressure on the breast increases the risk of spreading (undiscovered) cancer cells throughout the body. Want more scientific proof?

In 1995, the British medical journal, The Lancet, reported that since mammographic screening was introduced in the 1970's, the incidence of ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS), which represents 12 percent of all breast cancer cases, had increased by 328 percent and that 200 percent of this increase was due to the use of [mammography](#).

Here's an interesting fact - 80 percent of the 1.6 million breast biopsies performed each year in the United States, because of a suspicious mammography, are negative. So why does conventional medicine keep pushing this ineffective test? The answer is clear - the conventional cancer industry is a multi-billion dollar business where profits are more important than people.