Conscious Prosperity   
**by Joan Sotkin**

**A few years ago, I attended a non-denominational church that was very focused on prosperity. They hosted prosperity seminars and sermon topics often revolved around prosperity. Tithing 10% of earnings was touted as a prosperity tool and the pitch for funds was hard core.**

**Prosperity, as defined by traveling seminar leaders, meant having lots of money and material rewards. The promise was that if certain prosperity principles were followed, money would follow.**

**Despite their prosperity education most members of the congregation were not comfortable financially. The 10% of their earnings they struggled to give the church caused more pressure than cash flow and few ever felt they had enough.**

**If you have read the material on Prosperity Place, then you know that my definition of prosperity has more to do with how people feel than what they own. Longing and desire for more rarely coexist with satisfaction. It seems to me, that being satisfied is part of the prosperity equation, and money is not necessarily the key to satisfaction. There are many people who have lots of money and still feel empty, deprived and unfulfilled.**

**I'm a bit concerned by what seems to be a cultural obsession with having more of everything. Bill Gates, Warren Buffet and other ultra-rich individuals are often idealized because of their ability to amass large sums of money, huge houses and anything money can buy. Advertising reinforces our "need" for energy hungry cars and a dazzling array of gizmos and gadgets.**

**As a result of our perceived need for so many things, the majority of Americans are deeply in debt, paying today and tomorrow for yesterday's purchases and using up planetary resources in the process. Debt and prosperity do not go hand in hand.**

**I think we are reaching a point in our history when we have to become more conscious about what we do with our individual resources. Somehow, I have a problem with someone building a $50 million house (as Bill Gates is doing) when there are people living in cardboard boxes. It matters to me that nature is being depleted as people attempt to satisfy their emotional needs with things.**

**A basic spiritual tenet is that we are all one being expressing itself in myriad ways. By caring only for our individual accomplishments, we cannot connect to our greater self, which is one infinite being. By selfishly accumulating goods and financial energy, we deprive ourselves by not reaching or knowing our full potential.**

**It's a paradox that in order to experience individual freedom and abundance we have to connect to the collective consciousness of humanity. When we realize, even if only intellectually, that we are one, then we will care that many are deprived while relatively few flourish.**

**At this point, I don't know if it is possible to come up with a comprehensive solution that will lead to a more equitable system. But it is possible to set an intention to develop a new paradigm. Instead of blindly accepting the living standards defined by the advertising community, we can begin to dialog about alternatives. We can also make genuine inner satisfaction a goal and learn to appreciate what we have, not long for what we don't have.**

TURNING OFF CANCER

**THE CHINA STUDY; CHAPTER 3 (pages 43-67) TURNING OFF CANCER from Hallelujah Health Tip-Rev. George H. Malkmus Editor**

**"Americans DREAD CANCER more than any other disease. Slowly and painfully being consumed by cancer for months, even years, before passing away is a terrifying prospect. This is why cancer is perhaps the most feared of the major diseases. . .**

**"So when the media reports a newly found chemical carcinogen, the public takes notice and reacts quickly. Some carcinogens cause outright panic. Such was the case a few years ago with Alar, a chemical that was routinely sprayed on apples as a growth regulator. . . The public reaction was swift . . . [but] "the Alar story is not uncommon. Over the past several decades, several chemicals have been identified in the popular press as cancer-causing agents. You may have heard of some: DDT . . . Nitrites . . . Red Dye Number 2 . . . Artificial sweeteners . . . Dioxin . . . Aflatoxin . . .**

**"I know these unsavory chemicals quite well. I was a member of the National Academy of Sciences Expert Panel . . . charged with evaluating the potential danger . . . But while these chemicals are significantly different in their properties, they all have a similar story with regard to cancer. In each and every case, research has demonstrated that these chemicals MAY INCREASE CANCER RATES IN EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS. . .**

**Then Dr. Campbell reports on their experiments with "nitrosamines," which showed "that as chemical exposure increases, incidence of cancer also increases . . . How much NSAR (Nitrosamines) did the rats get? Both groups of rats were given an incredible amount. . . . no human studies were used to make the evaluation . . . Nonetheless, animal experiments alone are considered enough to conclude that NSAR is 'reasonably anticipated' to be a human carcinogen. . .**

**"To summarize the story: MARGINAL scientific results can make very big waves in the public when it comes to cancer- causing chemicals. A rise in cancer incidence from 5% to 10% in RATS FED LARGE QUANTITIES of nitrite caused an explosive controversy. . .**

**"BACK TO PROTEIN . . .The point isn't that nitrite is safe. It is the mere POSSIBILITY, however unlikely it may be, that it could cause cancer that alarms the public. But what if researchers produced considerably more impressive scientific results that were far more substantial? What if there was a chemical that experimentally turned 'ON' cancer in 100% of the test animals and its relative ABSENCE limited cancer to 0% of the animals? "Furthermore, what if this chemical were capable of acting in this way at ROUTINE levels of intake and not the EXTRAORDINARY levels used in the NSAR experiments? Finding such a chemical would be the holy grail of cancer research. The implications for human health would be enormous. One would assume that this chemical would be of considerably more concern than nitrite and Alar, and even more significant than aflatoxin, a highly ranked carcinogen.**

**"This is exactly what I saw in the Indian research paper when I was in the Philippines. THE CHEMICAL WAS PROTEIN, fed to rats at levels that are well within the range of normal consumption. PROTEIN! These results were more than startling. In the Indian study, when all the rats had been predisposed to get liver cancer after being given aflatoxin, only the animals fed 20% protein got the cancer, while those fed 5% protein got none. . .**

**"The question begged for answers. To further study this question, I sought and received the two National Institutes of Health (NIH) research grants . . . One was for a HUMAN STUDY, the other for an experimental animal study. I did not 'cry wolf' in either application by suggesting that PROTEIN MIGHT PROMOTE CANCER. I had everything to lose and nothing to gain by acting like a heretic. Besides, I wasn't convinced that protein actually might be harmful. . .**

**"The NIH funding for this study continued for the next nineteen years and led to additional funding from other research agencies . . . On these experimental animal findings alone, this project gave rise to more than 100 scientific papers published in some of the best journals, many public presentations and several invitations to participate on expert panels. . .**

**"From our extensive research, one idea seemed to be clear: LOWER PROTEIN INTAKE DRAMATICALLY DECREASED TUMOR INITIATION. This finding, even though well substantiated, would be enormously provocative for many people. . .**

**"These experiments also demonstrated that the body could 'remember' early carcinogen insults, even though they might then lie dormant with low protein intake. That is, exposure to aflatoxin left a genetic 'imprint' that remained dormant with 5% dietary protein until . . . later when this imprint reawakened . . . with 20% dietary protein. In simple terms, the body holds a grudge. It suggests that if we are exposed in the past to a carcinogen that initiates a bit of cancer that remains dormant, this cancer can still be 'REAWAKENED' by bad nutrition some time later. These studies showed that cancer development is modified by relatively MODEST changes in PROTEIN CONSUMPTION. . . .**

**EDITOR: For years, this editor has warned people who have seen their cancers go into remission on The Hallelujah Diet: "DON'T GO BACK TO CONSUMING ANIMAL PROTEIN!" Why had I issued this warning? Because I had received testimonies regarding a number of people who had seen cancers go into remission on our pure, low protein, plant based diet, RETURN AFTER ADDING CLEAN, ORGANICALLY GROWN, ANIMAL PROTEIN (chicken, salmon, raw milk & cheese) back into their diets. Up until now, I had not known "WHY" the cancers came back after adding animal protein back into their diets. Now, with Dr. Campbell's research, I understand the "WHY?"**

**"NOT ALL PROTEINS ARE ALIKE . . . If you have followed the story so far, you have seen how provocative these findings are. Controlling cancer through nutrition was, and still is, a radical idea. But as if this weren't enough, one more issue would yield explosive information: did it make any difference what type of protein was used in these experiments? For all of these experiments, we were using casein, which makes up 87% of cow's milk protein. So the next logical question was whether PLANT PROTEIN, tested in the same way, has the same effect on cancer promotion as casein. . .**

**"THE ANSWER IS AN ASTONISHING 'NO.' In these experiments, PLANT PROTEIN DID NOT PROMOTE CANCER GROWTH, even at HIGHER levels of intake. . . But the cancer-promoting factor in this case was cow's milk protein. It was difficult enough for my colleagues to accept the idea that protein might help cancer grow, but cow's milk protein? Was I crazy?**

**"The effects of protein feeding on tumor development were nothing less than spectacular. Rats generally live for about two years, thus the study was 100 weeks in length. All animals that were administered aflatoxin and fed the regular 20% levels of casein either were DEAD or near death from liver tumors at 100 weeks. All animals administered the same level of aflatoxin but fed the low 5% protein diet were ALIVE, active and thrifty, with sleek coats at 100 weeks. . . Let there be no doubt: COW'S MILK PROTEIN IS AN EXCEPTIONALLY POTENT CANCER PROMOTER in rats dosed with aflatoxin. . .**

**"Okay, so here's the central question: how does this research apply to human health . . . can we generalize these findings to other cancers and to other carcinogens? At the University of Illinois Medical Center in Chicago, another research group was working with mammary (breast) cancer in rats. This research showed that INCREASING intakes of casein PROMOTED THE DEVELOPMENT OF MAMMARY (BREAST) CANCER. . .**

**"An impressively consistent pattern was beginning to emerge. For two different organs, four different carcinogens and two different species, CASEIN PROMOTES CANCER GROWTH . . . What effects did other NUTRIENTS have on cancer . . . We initiated more studies . . . THE RESULTS OF THESE, AND MANY OTHER STUDIES, SHOWED NUTRITION TO BE FAR MORE IMPORTANT IN CONTROLLING CANCER PROMOTION THAN THE DOSE OF THE INITIATING CARCINOGEN. . .**

**"Furthermore, a pattern was beginning to emerge: nutrients from ANIMAL-BASED FOODS INCREASED TUMOR DEVELOPMENT while nutrients from PLANT BASED FOODS DECREASED TUMOR DEVELOPMENT. . . So much consistency was stunningly impressive, but one aspect of this research demanded that we remain cautious: all this evidence was gathered in experimental animal studies. . . are these principles regarding animal protein and cancer critically important for all humans in all situations, or are they merely marginally important for a minority of people . . .**

**"We need direct evidence from HUMAN research. . . Having the opportunity to do such a study is rare, at best, but by incredibly good luck we were given exactly the opportunity we needed. . . . We were given the chance to do a human study that would take all of these principles we had begun to uncover in the lab to the next level. It was time to study the role of nutrition, lifestyle and disease in the most comprehensive manner ever undertaken in the history of medicine. We were on to THE CHINA STUDY. . ."**

**This Editor considers Dr. Campbell's book, THE CHINA STUDY, a MUST READ for all who are interested in the TRUTH concerning the relationship of diet to disease. And though this book is not written from a biblical perspective, you will not read a book that promotes God's original Genesis 1:29 diet more powerfully. If you are interested in obtaining a copy of THE CHINA STUDY, call Hallelujah Acres at (800) 915-9355 or (704) 481-1700. In Canada call (519) 935-9999**