

Journal of Interprofessional Care , 1988, Vol. 3, No. 2 , Pages 91-98
The War on Cancer: I Victory or Deadlock?
By: H. S. Ladas

In the United States, the 'cancer establishment' has claimed victory in the war on cancer and used that claim to gain the support of the media, the public, and the government in order to obtain funding and to justify attacks on innovators. Critics have challenged the claims of victory and assert that those claims rest on statistical artifacts. This review is an examination of some of those statistical artifacts, measurement errors and violations of the canons of experimental design. Statistics showing improvements in cancer patient survival are exaggerated. Far from supporting survival statistics, the mortality and incidence statistics are badly biased, the distortions in incidence directly affect reported improvements in survival and directly impinge on many research studies. Statistical errors found in research reports include underreporting due to selection bias, overreporting of successes and inequitable treatment of treated as opposed to untreated cases. There are also instances of blatant statistical manipulation. The recent General Accounting Office Report on cancer assumes that improvement in treatment would support claims of improved survival, but the research which is supposed to establish treatment improvements also suffers from many weaknesses.

An overall view of the situation suggests that critics who have largely dealt with isolated pieces of the problem have not yet fully expressed the extent of these statistical biases and research flaws or the magnitude of the failure of the war on cancer.

Journal of Interprofessional Care, 1988, Vol. 3, No. 2 , Pages 99-108
The War on Cancer: II Reactions to Innovative Treatments
H.S. Ladas

Part I of this article supports the view that reported progress in the war on cancer is a statistical illusion and that research showing gains in treatment is flawed. Part II consists of examples from case studies on the treatment of innovators. The examples were selected for clarity and brevity and range from simple media distortion to scientific fraud. Thomas Kuhn used examples to support his thesis concerning the structure of scientific revolutions. He suggested that 'normal science' often suppresses fundamental novelties because they are necessarily subversive to its basic commitment. No part of the aim of normal science is to call forth new sorts of phenomena. Those that will not fit are often not seen at all or suppressed. This article supports Kuhn's thesis and suggests a number of psychological mechanisms to account for it. This, in turn, provides strong support for patient freedom of choice and for a more effective system of checks and balances to control government power and funding.