

wormwood cures Malaria



crossed (PRO)

I will be taking the majority of my information from this video thank you for taking. This video was posted by France 24 it is a YouTube channel with around a million subscriber. The reason why this France video is talking about sweet wormwood is because it has been banned in France because big pharma is afraid people would heal themselves with wormwood and they lie and say there is side effects when none exist. The only reason why it is illegal is from big pharma bribing

This source is very reliable

"**France 24** is an international news and current affairs television channel based in Paris. The channel is owned by the French Government and was launched in 2006."
https://wwitv.com/tv_channels/b2743.htm

At 11:10 through 11:52

A famous explorer got malaria he ate sweet wormwood and it killed 98 percent of the disease. Later the last 2 percent showed up. He started to take sweet wormwood as a herbal tea. In 24 hours he was feeling better. In 48 hours he was completely cured from the disease. Never has another malaria attack in his life

11:52 through 12:00

The famous explorer recounts his experience in a book that sold 400 thousand copies.

21:20 22:00

A native recounts how sweet wormwood cured him of malaria. He took drugs to no success. But a friend offered him a plant and by the 7th day he was cured of the disease.

22:00 to 23:00

he gets a masters degree in France to pursue research on the plant. But when he tried to share it. The higher ups got afraid because all their funding comes from big pharma

malaria

incidence among almost 300 workers drinking the tea, and followed up with the randomized controlled trial demonstrating the tea's effectiveness. Today, workers like Peter Osire, an irrigation supervisor, tell me it has been years since they had a fever."

a farm started growing the tea because 1500 of his workers were getting malaria. They got cured
<https://slate.com/technology/2013/04/wormwood-tea-to-treat-malaria-the-who-is-opposed-to-an-effective-preventive-medicine.html>



dpowell3543 (CON)

I'd like to start by thanking my opponent for this challenge, I look forward to it.


So first off, I'd like to point out that my opponent's claims are very faulty. The first one is a news source, that doesn't really support their claim as it's full of holes and based entirely on hearsay instead of scientific fact and evidence. It's also full of holes, which we will discuss shortly. The other is a terrible site to use. It's known for being very biased and opinion based. Again, this proves nothing. I've also read through myself during my research and already ruled it out as an invalid source. Given this info, let's discuss the holes in my opponent's first argument. From what we can all see, the people in the video discuss how they started taking wormwood and the symptoms disappeared. This does not mean that the disease has been cured, it means it's being treated. There's a slight difference. My opponent seems to have forgotten that just because you're no longer experiencing the side effects doesn't mean that the disease is gone. The next issue with my opponent's argument is the claim that wormwood has no side effects. Well it does. It has a lot of serious side effects. This ranges from allergic reactions to worsening preexisting issues in the victim. We'll see this in the link I shall provide down below. Given this, the burden of proof still lies solely with my opponent. They are responsible to find substantial scientific evidence that wormwood can and has, cured malaria in a human being. I wish them luck. Again,


I'd like to thank my opponent for the challenge, and I look forward to reading their next


I'd like to thank my opponent for the challenge and I look forward to reading their next arguments.

<https://www.rxlist.com/wormwood/supplements.htm>

Cross-Examination

: In the next round, please provide a scientific study, or other scientific proof that wormwood can cure malaria.

: Dpowell3543 France 24 is a tv news channle in france it is like msnbc or abc.You can find articles saying fox news is fake news.Fox news is not fake news so Finding articles against it is pointless.Secondly The second person cured by it is a doctor.Secondly the last article where the farm was treating and curing the 300 people from maleria with wormwood.Thy were cured in a heavily controlled trail.supervised by peter osire.

: There are no side effects.Those are lies pushed by big pharma.My video explainst that pretty well.If that is not enough here is an article about big pharma conspiracy against tumeric.
<https://www.doctorshealthpress.com/general-health-articles/natural-remedies/turmeric>



crossed (PRO)

The source is not biased.The source is owned by he french goverment.So it is reliable according to what i believe your standard of reliability.The people cured are reliable to.The first guy was mainstream enough to sell a book with 400k copies.The second guy was a doctor.This is not some tiny organization making this claim.The second article.The people were cured in a heavily controlled trail.This article meets my standard of reliability.You have given no reason to question it it.Again the supposed sweet wormwood side effects are made up by big pharma.According to

the video




dpowell3543 (CON)

Hello everyone. Welcome to the second round of this debate. I'd like to start by debunking my opponent's cross examination. The first point they made, was France 24 is a news source and that it's not "fake news". I'd like to point out that I never said that it was fake news, I just said that it wasn't a credible enough source because it doesn't contain any form of proof outside of hearsay. Which brings me to the next point. My opponent named at least two individuals and one group who supposedly used wormwood to cure malaria. Again, there is no proof. My opponent is just expecting all of us to believe them because they said so, this is a logical fallacy. My opponent's next point is a completely asinine claim. They, yet again, tried to claim that wormwood has no side effects, despite the fact I provided scientific evidence to the contrary that was comprised of studies. They attempt to claim that they're just "lies" spread by big pharma, but that's just ludicrous. Yet again, something they have absolutely no proof that supports their claims. They also provide a source that has nothing to do with this debate at all, but is also very unreliable, as it is clearly biased. My opponent claims that, since the source is owned by the French government, it's reliable. That's not how that works. As I specifically stated, it has to be scientific. As for the people claiming that it cures Malaria. My opponent has yet again forgotten the fact that just because the symptoms disappear, doesn't mean the disease has as well. They can claim that wormwood cured their malaria all they want, but that's not proof. If my opponent wants them to be liable sources, they must


- A. prove that those individuals even had malaria to begin with and
- B. prove that they no longer have the disease.


These are things my opponent simply won't be able to do. Without any actual, scientific evidence, my opponent's arguments are empty and invalid. Operating entirely on scripted rumor.


Cross-Examination


: Again. Please provide actual scientific evidence. You're news report and biased opinion article is not scientific evidence, it's just hearsay as I have explained. So in your next and final round, I would like to see you provide legitimate, scientific proof that wormwood has at some


point actually cured someone, instead of operating entirely off of rumor. You bring up a trial, but there's no proof at all that it actually even happened or if it even succeeded.


: I'd also like to see you touch up on the doctor. What kind of doctor is he? There are many kinds of doctors. Just because he holds the title, doesn't mean he's a medical professional, or even remotely qualified to "confirm" if wormwood can actually cure malaria.


: One last thing. Wormwood is a key ingredient in Absinthe, the strongest and often considered the most dangerous alcoholic beverage ever created. Yet you want to tell us that it has no side effects? You also want to sit there and deny the fact there are actually people out there who are allergic to wormwood?


: Dpowell There are thousands of study's on plants with medical properties. You can not chuck all of them out as not real. Secondly the people cured in the article. It is not hearsay. Everyone who is talking about the event are all licenced individual. The guy who is a doctor. is a medical proffosional he cures people in africa all th etime. He has gotte all hte stupid coledge stuff. There is no reason to question his etheticity. The second article is no way hearsay. They were cured in a watched controlled trail. The video talks about how the side effects are faked.

: at 13.13 to 15 a proffesor try's to tell the world health organization what this plant can do. The World health organization say's some evil things and the next day Post lies about the plant on there home page. This has been sientifically proven. It is even a denial of history. at 5.35 They used wormwood to cure and treat maleria. It is how they beat us in several battle in the veitnom war


: I'm not saying those studies are faked. I'm asking you to provide at least one of these studies. You need to provide one of those studies to prove your poj t

: *point

: Again. The video doesn't say he's a medical doctor of any kind. They just call him doctor. They also never mention his schooling. So can you prove that he's a credible source? Can you also prove that what he's saying is true and not just lies to get attention? Like I've stated. You haven't provided any legitimate evidence that wormwood can cure malaria. You've only provided a biased opinion article and a news report that shows people saying that wormwood got rid of their symptoms, not the disease. If anyone in the video did claim that their malaria was cured by wormwood, they didn't prove it.

: Without evidence, it's just hearsay. As I stated in my arguments, you're expecting everyone to just take their word for it, even though they haven't and cannot prove it. For instance. The

study. There's no proof that the trial even occurred, they just said it happened and then changed the subject.

: Last but not least. As I said earlier, claiming that wormwood doesn't have side effects is just like claiming prescription drugs don't have side effects. A majority of those same studies you claim to exist also show that wormwood has side effects. That's why there are dozens of sites that talk about the risks of wormwood including herbology sites. Now. For the last time. In this last round, please provide some legitimate evidence to prove your claim. Without your arguments are baseless and invalid.



crossed (PRO)

These people have not had malaria ever again in their entire life. The people who were cured are not simply hearsay. The French government acknowledges that they were cured. The French government is saying that they being cured was real. He keeps ignoring points. Like at 5:30, the communist leader Ho Chi Minh won many battles in the Vietnam War by using sweet wormwood tea to treat and cure his troops of malaria. 5:30. Con keeps ignoring that my second article says that the 300 people cured of malaria were done in a heavily controlled experiment to see how effective the plant is. These people have been re-infected by the French government to have malaria and to have been cured of it.

If you got cancer and you went to the Mayo Clinic and got cured of it. If you and they Mayo Clinic said you were cured. Would that be considered hearsay. If not then why is a doctor in Africa who has been cured by sweet wormwood considered hearsay.

If the symptoms are gone and the disease does not affect you, yes, you have been cured of the disease. If it has been 40 years and or 50 years with no disease, you have been cured. Con needs to stop with this just because the disease is gone does not mean you're cured stuff.

"researcher named Patrick Ogwang with the Ugandan Ministry of Health documented a decline of malaria incidence among almost 300 workers drinking the tea, and followed up with the randomized controlled trial demonstrating the tea's effectiveness. Today, workers like Peter Osire,

an irrigation supervisor, tell me it has been years since they had a fever."

Stop ignoring this.the disease is gone. it works like an acid

<https://slate.com/technology/2013/04/wormwood-tea-to-treat-malaria-the-who-is-opposed-to-an-effective-preventive-medicine.html>

There are no side effects my video explains that they were made up by big pharma.This has nothing to do with the debate i will leave it at that.i am out of space.

It really does look like god put medicine in plants for all disease that exist.



dpowell3543 (CON)

In my opponent's final arguments, they claimed that I have ignored their arguments. As I'm sure everyone has noticed, this is not true. I have touched up and debunked all of my opponent's arguments. If I "ignore" their second article, it is because I have, as we've all seen in the first round, debunked it as a biased and unreliable source. Therefore its hold in the debate ceased to exist. My opponent also doesn't seem to understand what I mean by their arguments being based entirely off of hearsay. They keep bringing up individuals who claimed that have malaria and used wormwood to treat it, however, as I've already explained there's several things wrong with it.

1. There's no proof that they ever actually had malaria.
2. There's no proof that the disease is actually cured and not just dormant.
3. There's no proof of their credibility.

My opponent brings up timestamp 5:30 of the video where it talked about a communist leader who used wormwood to "cure malaria". However, the video doesn't mention malaria. It specifically says that the soldiers started to feel sick, so they used wormwood from China to make them feel better. My opponent also talks about "trials" and "studies" but doesn't provide any proof of these. So as far as me and the readers are concerned, they never happened. My

opponent's arguments have been nothing but straw man arguments. They've made a claim, but made no effort to provide proof to support it. This leaves my opponent's argument empty, biased and flawed. They've also failed to provide the legitimate scientific evidence that I have asked for several times. Last, but not least, my opponent still makes the false claim that big pharma lied about wormwood having side effects. I have easily proven otherwise. I shall now also provide another source that proves otherwise. It also shows that wormwood may be good for a few things, but malaria is not on that list.

<https://www.winchesterhospital.org/health-library/article?id=111819>
