Re: ALA is a better chelator than DMSA, so why are we using DMSA?

Subject: Re: ALA is a better chelator than DMSA, so why are we using DMSA?
From: RMart620@a...
Date: Wed, 11 Jul 2001 19:53:10 EDT
Yahoo! Message Number: 28350
Onibasu Link: http://onibasu.com/archives/am/28350.html

Hi Everyone,

Was out of town camping for a few days and then working lots due to the nursing shortage. Am finally trying to catch up on my e-mail.

I will repost the Leskova article that Andy mentioned below, but I also want to add some comments as I did previously in regard to this source. (My original posts to this group are from 4/15/01 and entitled "ALA as a chelator" "Leskova article translation #1" "Leskova article translation #2".)

First of all, the study was submitted to the Russian journal in 1978. There are several flaws to the study that I will point out. There is no evidence that it has EVER been reproduced, the only similar article that has been located shows that ALA carried mercury INTO the brain of rats (Gregus Z, et al, Effect of lipoic acid on biliary excretion of glutathione and metals, Toxicology & Applied Pharmacology 1992 May;114(1):88-96)- the rats in the Gregus study actually had their brains dissected and the mercury measured, which was not done in the Leskova article.

Now about flaws in the Leskova study. It appears that ALA and mercury were administered at the same time, so regardless of the fact that this was considered (for rats) to be chronic mercury poisoning, it is actually still acute poisoning, it does not address mercury that has been in the tissue for a long time and is tightly bound.

Based on the Gregus article, it is apparent that ALA can and does cross the BBB, but I see no evidence in the Leskova article that it actually pulled mercury OUT of the brain. (Why did they not dissect and measure mercury in the brain, like they did in other tissue?)

The article discusses neurological symptoms in the mercury fed group, but makes no mention of neuro symptoms in the group fed both mercury and ALA. It does not say that this group had less neuro symptoms, merely "For animals of the 4th group only hair falling out was observed." I find this comment strange, it seems some of the animals must have had some kind of health problem since 3 of them died, but that is not discussed. What did they die of, what kind of symptoms did they have, was it related to mercury poisoning, since most systems are effected by mercury- how would they know if it was related or not? The article also says that the mercury poisoned group had

Mercury excretion was increased via both urine and feces when given ALA, but they evaluated mercury at the end of 5 months in only the liver and kidneys (the same organs that Gregus found to have decreased amounts) but they didn't evaluate the brain- which Gregus found to have elevated levels.

Just because there was more mercury excreted in urine and feces when given ALA than when not given ALA is no proof that the ALA pulled it from the brain. (Please also see the Gregus article I am sending- they found the same thing, but it is because there was a change in the distribution pattern with the use of ALA.) Feces is the natural elimination method, if you don't test before and after, you don't even know if the excretion is increased, let alone where it coming out of- perhaps the liver, through bile? (ALA appears to increase elimination via the bowel, while DMSA increases urinary excretion, but remember, the kidneys and liver are also target organs.)

There are also articles that show ALA by itself is a very poor mercury chelator. (Keith, RL "Utilization of renal slices to evaluate the efficacy of chelating agents for removing mercury from the kidney." Toxicology 1997 Jan 15; 116 (1-3) : 67-75; Refsvik T, "Excretion of methyl mercury in rat bile: the effect of thioctic acid, thioalide, hexadecyl- and octadecylmercaptoacetate" Acta Pharmacologica et Toxicologica, 1982 Mar;50(3):196-205)

> From several physicians and other health care professionals (members of ACAM, and Dr. Laidler of the DAN! mercury protocol) to whom I have presented the Leskova article, I have been given the following opinions: "I would consider the use of Lipoic Acid in suspected mercury toxicity to be very dangerous." "ALA has been hypothesized to take mercury out of the cells and across the blood brain barrier- this has not been tested by any experiment that I am aware of." "This line of reasoning is hypothetical at best." "There are other explanations for improvement than ALA removing mercury from the brain."

Ruth (RN) mom to Jeremy, 17,
autism/LKS
<<Message: 15

Date: Fri, 29 Jun 2001 17:50:47 -0000

From: AndyCutler

Subject: Re: ALA is a better chelator than DMSA, so why are we using DMSA?
--- In Autism-Mercury, jan.perkins wrote:

> > Thus, when you permeabilize the blood-brain barrier with ALA, some
>
> > mercury goes INTO the brain from the blood, even though in net you are
>
> > removing mercury from the brain. In fact, some of the mercury that
>
> > leaks out of the brain in one place may go back in at another, so that
>
> > even if there is no mercury in the blood to start, there will be some

> This fits with what I have reasoned from luking briefly. So would a
>
> course of ALA followed by a blood test be a reasonable way of doing a
>
> challenge test prior to considering full blown chelation protocols?

No, because there are no standards to compare it to, and if there is

only mercury in your brain, the amount is quite small when it is mixed

into the entire body so that a "challenge" of this sort on even a

fairly toxic person won't necessarily show a great increase in blood

levels.

> > This is also why ALA chelation alone is effective for detox
>
> > - ALA is an excellent chelating agent and will clear the brain, liver
>
> > and the rest of the body just fine on its own.

> Do you have information on protocols for this, or can you refer me to
>
> good references?

My book Amalgam Illness, Diagnosis and Treatment, described at

http://hometown.aol.com/noamalgam, and the ALA info derives in part

from a Russian language article by Leskova in the journal Gigiena

Truda of which a couple of translations were posted on this list a

while ago, one by Ruth Martin (Rmart620).
Andy>>

Onibasu Link: http://onibasu.com/archives/am/28350.html

- **Replies to this message:**
  - *No replies to this message*
- **This message is a reply to:**
  - *No parent messages found*

Showing slice of current thread:

- **Re: ALA is a better chelator than DMSA, so why are we using DMSA? RMart620**
  - ALA is a better chelator than DMSA, so why are we using DMSA? ltldab1
    - Re: ALA is a better chelator than DMSA, so why are we using DMSA? "ericshirl" <ericshirl>
    - Re: ALA is a better chelator than DMSA, so why are we using DMSA? "andya69" <andyg>

- Next by date: Andy, please explain rfeurer
- Previous in same thread: Andy, please explain rfeurer
- Next in same thread: Andy, please explain rfeurer

Other links

- All messages for this mailing list by date
- Information about this mailing list
- To search **multiple** mailing lists, use the search tool on the home page.

Recent Blogs »

- Insulin Resistance may cause Alzheimer's
  - Thursday, June 2, 2005
- Homemade Shampoo & Conditioner
  - Wednesday, May 25, 2005
- Liver Flush Debate
  - Wednesday, May 18, 2005
- Can Kombucha Mold Cause Cancer?
  - Thursday, April 28, 2005
- Survivalism for Everyone
  - Sunday, April 24, 2005
- Cod Liver Oil: Murky Contents
  - Saturday, April 16, 2005

Tips!

We now support Yahoo! message number portability. Tell me more »

Do you want to see your Yahoo! group archived in Onibasu? Click here for more details.
