

"The widespread animal experimentation is of no practical use whatever in furthering the art and science of medicine. It is certainly up to the well-instructed members of the medical profession to denounce it. As regards this journal at any rate, we shall continue to do so." - Editorial, *Medical Review*, Sept., 1957.

OF MICE AND CANCER



"We have learned very well how to treat cancer in mice and rats but we still can't cure people." - Professor Colin Garner, *Genetic Engineering & Biotechnology News*, Vol. 27, No. 15, 2007.

"God knows we've cured mice of all sorts of tumours. But that isn't medical research." -- Thomas E Wagner, senior scientist at Ohio University's Edison Biotechnology Institute, *The Columbus Dispatch*, March 20, 1998.

"No animal tumor is closely related to a cancer in human beings," Editorial, *Lancet*, April 15, 1972.

"[Mouse models are] woefully inadequate... if you look at the millions and millions and millions of mice that have been cured, and you compare that to the relative success, or lack thereof, that we've achieved in the treatment of metastatic disease clinically, you realize that there just has to be something wrong with those models." - Homer Pearce, research fellow at Eli Lilly. *Fortune*, March 9, 2006.

"Everyone should know that most cancer research is largely a fraud and that the major cancer research organisations are derelict in their duties to the people who support them." - Linus Pauling, Ph.D., two time Nobel Prize winner, in the magazine *Outrage*, Oct/Nov 1986.

"Maybe the raising of millions of dollars of funds for charitable projects has become a 'racket'... Maybe we should investigate the American Cancer Society's operations." - U.S. Representative Roland Libonati, as quoted in *Medical Dark Ages*.

"The American Cancer Society, designated by charter as an 'emergency' organization which must disband the day a cure is found, has enjoyed its emergency status since 1913 and, by every indication, is determined to be its beneficiary still in the year 2013." - David Rorvik, A Defense of Unorthodoxy, *Harper's*, June 1976.

.....

In 1971 the National Cancer Act initiated a "War on Cancer" that many sponsors predicted would cure cancer by 1976. Instead, this multibillion dollar research program has proven to be a failure. The age-adjusted total cancer mortality rate climbed steadily for decades until the early 1990s, when this rate started to fall slowly, due largely to reduced smoking. Since 1999, cancer has been the number one cause of death for Americans under 85 years old, displacing heart disease; for those Americans 45-64 years old cancer causes more deaths than the next three causes combined (source: American Cancer Society).

Cancer is a long way from being conquered. The prodigious amount of time, money and resources spent on drugs, together with advances in highly sophisticated diagnostic machinery as well as the ritual sacrifice of hundreds of millions of animals in experiments have done practically nothing to alleviate the suffering from cancer.

The medical industry has a cancer cure rate of 2%, while 27% of all cancer patients recover completely without doing anything at all. (Often the shock of the diagnoses leads them to the necessary lifestyle changes to get well again.. the truth is out there.) That means the medical establishment is even killing the 25% of patients that would have recovered on their own. The body has a natural ability to ward off cancer. Everybody gets cancer some 6 to 10 times in life but will never even know about

it. That is, if they don't get trapped by the early detection hoaxes that are only used to create customers. No one gets cured of cancer and no cancer is ever prevented by a mammography, colonoscopy, etc.

Chemotherapy is *causing* cancer, not curing it. Radiation is *causing* cancer, not curing it. And surgery usually *spreads* the cancer like an explosion throughout the entire body.

The medical profession is the number one cause of death in the western world and medication is the main cause of new illnesses and symptoms. Should you trust a profession that statistically has a life span of 56 years of age and one of the highest drug and alcohol abuse and suicide rates in the world?

Over the last few decades we have all become much more aware of cancer, for today cancer is no longer the rarity it once was - it's a disease of epidemic proportions that affects us all. Every day the media trumpet abroad sensational stories of a new cure "just around the corner." The cure will always remain "just around the corner" because the various "stakeholders" don't want a cure to be found. Many of the health research charities are led by medical doctors whose loyalty is to their brothers and sisters in orthodox medicine.

Commenting on a media pronouncement of yet one more "fantastic breakthrough" thanks to animal studies, G. Timothy Johnson, medical editor for ABC News and WCVB-TV news in Boston, wrote in a letter to the editor of the Boston Globe, on May 22, 1998: "My own medical perspective is that animal cancer research should be regarded as the scientific equivalent of gossip—with about the same chance of turning out to be true, i.e. truly effective in humans. Some gossip turns out to be true, but most of it does not...and gossip can cause great anguish for those affected, in this case millions of desperate cancer patients worldwide."

Furthermore, virtually all of the charities are partially funded by the pharmaceutical industry. Big Pharma, as it is called, wants all of the research money to go to drug research. Economics and politics intertwine in shaping conventional medicine's approach to cancer. Very simply put, treating disease is enormously profitable, preventing disease is not.

A cancer charity is a huge cash cow, and no one is willing to let that cash cow be put out to pasture by finding a

cure for cancer. The "charities" evolve into being public relations arms of the pharmaceutical industry, the so-called "ethical" drug industry, which is constantly in the news for its unethical activities such as illegal experimentation, marketing drugs for unapproved uses, ghostwriting, misleading doctors, falsifying science, kickback schemes and wholesale Medicaid fraud, among other crimes. <http://www.alternet.org/story/124266/or>

Despite the general recognition that 85% of all cancers is caused by environmental influences, less than 10 per cent of the (U.S.) National Cancer Institute budget is given to environmental studies. And despite the recognition that the majority of environmental causes are linked to nutrition, less than 1 per cent of the National Cancer Institute budget is devoted to nutrition studies. And even that small amount had to be forced on the Institute by a special amendment of the National Cancer Act in 1974.

Cancer research has actually hampered progress. Until the beginning of the twentieth century cancer was studied mainly as it existed in human beings - in the consulting room, at the bedside, in the operating theatre and in the post mortem room. And that search was of the widest possible character. Not only pathology, but physiology, anthropology, zoology, botany were made to contribute material, and so also were history, chemistry and statistics.

When it was discovered that cancers could be grown artificially in laboratory animals, it seemed to facilitate the investigation of cancer. Laboratory mice grow cancers much more quickly than do humans and they were expendable in a way that a doctor's patients were not. The researcher could use the mouse as he would a test tube or flask, and throw it away when done with it.

Cancer research on mice was so much easier than clinical research that there seemed every justification for the optimism with which this discovery was regarded. It looked like the solution of the cancer problem. And so laboratories were built all over the civilized world; huge sums of money were spent; the lives of many scientists were devoted to the quest; and whole libraries of magazine articles and books testified to the scientists' stolid patience, industry and ability.

This artificial production of cancers in multitudes of small animals is directed toward discovering how to slow down or stop the growth of the deadly cancers inflicted upon

them. This was supposed to then alleviate or cure malignant disease in humans. Its deplorable actual result has been that in 100 years and after hundreds of millions spent, the experimenters' skills had not even improved sufficiently to prevent the ever-increasing numbers of cancers.

In the last three years, the following major agencies and government bodies reported on the unreliability of animal testing and/or recommended replacing animal testing with *in vitro* and human-based methods:

1. **The US Institute of Medicine.**
2. **The US National Research Council of the Academy of Science**
3. **The Science Board of the US Food and Drug Administration**
4. **The US Environmental Protection Agency**

Animal research does not reliably transfer to humans. The reason for this is that there are immutable differences in the anatomy, physiology, disease susceptibility, natural history of disease, response to treatments, and most importantly the genetics between humans and nonhumans.

Too many researchers still ignore these crucial facts. The major part of the vast bulk of cancer research is done on mice, but the pharmacological responses of mice have zero statistical relationship to humans. Graphically shown, the correlation is what is commonly called a "scattergram" – no correlation at all. Cancer drug testing in mice has the lowest accuracy rate of any disease using any animal model (Kola-2004; Roses-2003).

More than 95% of cancer treatments developed in mice fail in humans, and the few that are approved do not cure anyone (sources: FDA, Kola-2004). We'd be better off to just flip a coin! This is not science - it's a lottery! However, we are not playing games. At stake are health and life.

In the last four decades, more than \$200 BILLION has been spent on cancer research in the USA, mostly on animal experiments, and most of those using mice--without producing any reliable cures (source: Gapstur-2010). Of all the factors that might contribute to lower cancer death rates – prevention, early detection, and treatment – the only one that has had no significant survival benefit is treatment (source: Cutler-2008). A shift in research emphasis is pressingly necessary, away from research on treatment and drugs to research on

prevention, if substantial progress against cancer is to be forthcoming (source: Baillar-1997).

According to a former director of the US National Cancer Institute: "The history of cancer research has been a history of curing cancer in the mouse. We have cured mice of cancer for decades, and it simply didn't work in humans." (source: Klausner-1998).

Replacing animal testing is inevitable; the science is too overwhelming to deny. But we need to move more quickly, because we waste money, time, and hope as long as we persist in a failed methodology.

We don't need to be cruel to animals to protect human health. We do need to replace animal testing with *in vitro* and human-specific methods. Clinical, epidemiological, and pathological investigations remain the foundation of research on human disease.

The next time you are asked to donate to a cancer organization, bear in mind that your money will be used to sustain an industry which has been deemed by many eminent scientists as a qualified failure and by others, as a complete fraud. If you would like to make a difference, inform these organizations that you won't donate to them until they change their approach to one which is focussed on prevention and study of the human condition rather than animals. We have the power to change things by making their present approach unprofitable. It is only through our charitable donations and taxes that these institutions survive on their present unproductive path.

For more information see: <http://www.pcrm.org/>
<http://curedisease.net/>

Animal Defense & Anti-Vivisection Society of BC,
Box 391, Station A, Vancouver, BC, V5C 2N2.
Ph. 778-230-2907.
<http://vivisectionresearch.ca>