

Campaigning with scientific experts for personalised medicine: effective treatments and cures tailor made "for the patient by the patient".

26th April 2015

Dear BUAV,

Please help us quickly

I am writing as a multiple sclerosis patient and in my capacity as founder and director of the new organization Patients Campaigning For Cures. I also write as a devoted companion to my dog Patch, without whom life would be unimaginable, and as someone who always buys 'cruelty free' cosmetics and household products.

Having MS often means a huge struggle to co-ordinate hand movement at a keyboard, so I am asking you to please read this letter with that in mind, thank you in advance.

Our organization is troubled by your persistent promotion of a misleading campaign called 'Vote Cruelty Free'. Our medical position is provided by the leading scientific Board in its field, [Americans and Europeans for Medical Advancement](#). We are especially worried by the following aspects of your promotion, our comments are below each point:

- 'Vote Cruelty Free' calls for an end to 'non-medical experiments' and states that funding is allocated to only 13% (12% on your political manifestos) of lab animals which claim to 'directly benefit human health'.

This is false. The true statistic reflects the fact that funding is allocated to around 80% of the UK's annual total of over 4 million lab animals, who are subjected to 'basic' research experiments which masquerade as 'applied' research - falsely claiming to be effective in the development of new treatments and cures for patients such as myself. Our medical Board [addresses](#) the importance of making sure this statistic is correct, and Andre Menache also addressed this during a [recent talk](#). In misleading the public and political candidates, 'Vote Cruelty Free' falsely suggests that millions of precious research funds are not wasted on 'medical experiments', which also fail humans! You may be interested to hear that we are supporting the dedicated campaign '[Victims of Charity](#)', which exposes monthly examples of this appalling financial waste, also highlighted in their impressive [new petition](#).

- 'Vote Cruelty Free' is selective in its call for a ban on experiments on certain animals - primates, cats and dogs - and those involved in the most 'extreme suffering' experiments.

This ignores current medical knowledge because it is selective about animals, and limits its focus to the most extreme suffering experiments. Current medical understanding clearly [demonstrates](#)

that no laboratory animal – licensed for experiments which involve any level of suffering, be it moderate or extreme - is capable of acting as a 'predictive model' for a human patient. By ignoring this position held by up-to-date medical science, 'Vote Cruelty Free' also ignores the significance it holds for animals.

Our medical Board has recently named [Trans-Species Modeling Theory](#) (TSMT), which is similar in significance to the Germ Theory of Disease, the Theory of Relativity and the Theory of Evolution. TSMT does what all great scientific Theories do: it places decades of practical examples - in our case the failure of animal models to predict human responses in disease research and the safety testing of new medicines - and places this within a wider context, in our case current understanding of evolutionary biology and complexity, to explain exactly why these practical examples always have – and always will – occur. So in our case, TSMT explains exactly how and why laboratory animal models fail humans.

Current medical understanding is increasingly becoming the focus of the wider scientific community, including the British Medical Journal who published their Editor's Choice in June last year, titled [How Predictive and Productive is Animal Research?](#) This article concluded by quoting from the paper it cited:

"If research conducted on animals continues to be unable to reasonably predict what can be expected in humans, the public's continuing endorsement and funding of preclinical animal research seems misplaced".

Indeed senior cancer investigator made this the subject of his [comment](#) following an article in Nature.

83 Westminster candidates are now calling for harmful, false claims - made on behalf of patients such as myself by scientists from the animal model community, who continue to claim that animal models save patients' lives - to be held to thorough medical account in properly moderated public scientific debate hearings, with the leading Board which represents us. The [conditions](#) for these hearings have been endorsed as "well set out and fair" by Britain's foremost human rights defence barrister Michael Mansfield QC.

Thank you for your time in reading this. We hope to hear back from you soon, and that you will want to help us quickly.

Yours sincerely,

Rebecca Groves

Founder and Director

PCFC

Patients Campaigning For Cures

<http://patientscampaigningforcures.org>
info@patientscampaigningforcures.org