

Evolution 2.0 Newsletter

Volume 6, Issue 4

A Sturdy Sled and a Team of Good Dogs

In February 2022, I went to Antarctica with a handful of eccentric folks led by Yanik Silver. It was one of the epic experiences of my life. Both mind-altering and soul-soothing. I'd love to talk to you about that trip sometime. But since that trip I've been obsessed with tales of exploration of the 7th continent.

And recently I heard an angle on the early 20th century race to be the first human to get to the South Pole that I had not heard before. It was on a podcast called *Cautionary Tales*. Very brief summary...

Robert Scott was a British explorer of renown. He had the financial and scientific support from the world's most powerful empire, the United Kingdom. He had EVERYTHING he could possibly want.



Roald Amundsen was a Norwegian explorer of great experience but lesser fame. Norway was a much smaller and less wealthy nation. Amundsen did not enjoy the massive support that Scott had.

Both men set off for the South Pole at the same time.

Who do you think got there first?

In his diaries, Scott tells of catastrophe after catastrophe. Sledges sinking. Horses dying. Frostbite and scurvy.

Scott *did* make it to the South Pole...but died on the way back.

Amundsen's diaries, on the other hand, make his journey seem positively breezy compared to Scott's! He zipped down and got to the South Pole BEFORE Scott and raced back to worldwide acclaim.

How did Goliath manage to lose to David?

Scott had EVERYTHING he could possibly want...and that was the problem. When you have everything you could possibly want, you also get a LOT of what you don't want. Scott had a truckload of scientific equipment and horses and experimental machinery that did not help him get to the pole faster. In fact it weighed him down and slowed him down.

Scott had several goals. Get to the pole, do scientific experiments, test transportation machinery...

Donate at www.evo2.org/cancer

Amundsen, on the other hand, took ONLY what he needed (**dogs**, not mechanical sledges and horses and scientific equipment!) to get to the pole FAST and get back safely.

Amundsen had ONE goal. He took only what he needed to achieve that ONE goal as quickly and efficiently as possible.

Scott's was a bureaucratic governmental project. Amundsen's was entrepreneurial.

I had read Scott's autobiography *South* before listening to this podcast. I even remember him writing something like, "sledging is the purest form of courage and character building that you have ever seen in your life, and my men executed day after day of pulling sledges through the snow without a murmur of complaint." Yes, the virtues of the arduous work he put his men through moving these heavy, slow, inefficient sledges day after brutally frigid day.

I remember thinking *Wow, that's pretty impressive.*

Then I listened to the podcast and thought, "*Sledging is the dumbest idea I've ever heard.*"

I've done really stupid things in my life and justified them as "character development." When I worked in sales, I might even boast on a good day that "cold calling is the purest form of character building."

No. It's just stupid.

Fortunately nobody died from my cold-calling "stupidity."

And only a handful of explorers died from Scott's institutional "stupidity."

But 300,000 Americans perish every single year in the "Cancer Antarctica" from the same kind of stubbornness...every single year.

Wall Street and tax-funded cancer research has been a Scott-like catastrophe. They've had all the money and support they could possibly want, **\$250 billion++ and counting**, and they are not appreciably closer to the South Pole than they were FIFTY YEARS AGO.

The British establishment loaded up Scott with "side projects" while he was down in the snow. They had nothing whatsoever to do with getting to the pole. They also had very little to do with solving immediate practical problems. They were mostly intended to enhance the prestige of the British academic institutions. To publish impressive papers about penguins and algae. This was done for *optics* rather than winning the prize.

Sound familiar?

Donate at www.evo2.org/cancer

Obsessive focus on academic prestige and publishing plagues cancer research. Billions tossed into the blizzard in the name of institutional glory. We could do so much more for so much less...

Give me 50 sled dogs and I'll get us to the pole



What “Robert Scott Problems” are weighing down the cancer research mission to find a cure?

They are outlined in our 5 Rules for Funding Cancer Research on page 8 of this letter, but let's hear from some of the scientists on the snow.

Jinsong Liu, an M.D. Anderson Cancer Center pathologist, has been examining the disease pathways of deceased cancer patients for 30 years. He discovered human tumors follow the same development paths as embryos, showing that cancer is a “Dark Twin” of healthy cells and follows many similar pathways.

A few weeks ago, Jinsong was speaking at a cancer pathology conference in Chicago and he reached out. “Perry, can I stop by for a visit?”

He came by the house on a hot July day, where he told me, “Most researchers think cancer is a chaotic, unpredictable beast. No. It follows the exact stages of embryo development, except it's a “dark embryo” instead of a “light” one. It is very predictable. But the problem is that **most**



Donate at www.evo2.org/cancer

cancer researchers have never seen or touched cancer...and they don't study embryos at all.

“They’ve only seen pictures of tissue samples on a computer screen. But who actually takes those tissue samples? A **pathologist** who cuts open the tumors. And how many pathologists do you meet at a cancer conference?”

Almost zero.

Trying to reach the South Pole without seeing ice. But scientists like Jinsong physically handle it every day. Most cancer researchers just keep studying genomes, genomes, genomes, mutations, mutations, mutations. Allegedly “random” “unpredictable” mutations that have to be napalmed to death.

Recall Robert Scott trying to force motorized sledges through thick snow in the Antarctic. Any Norwegian skier would tell you it won't work. Anyone who had *traveled* terrain like that would know it's stupid.

A Bell Labs of Cancer?

I spoke to Ken Pienta, a cancer researcher and doctor who treats patients at Johns Hopkins recently. I asked him: “Imagine you're on a Utopian island where you could create your own research program and run it any way you want. Suppose you were unencumbered by the academic, biological, evolutionary and institutional dogma and dollars-driven despotism. What would you do?”

His eyes LIT UP.

Ken said, “We need something like Bell Labs. We need a program where scientists are free to pursue promising research without many of the limitations, but still held to the same rigorous standards of the best science.”

In the 1940s and 50s Bell Laboratories was an incubator of practical scientific inquiry. It was prolific and productive mostly because it gave scientists free reign to follow their genius and creativity. Innovation after innovation streamed out of Bell.



- Data Networking
- The Transistor
- Cellular Telephone Technology

Donate at www.evo2.org/cancer

- Solar Cells
- Lasers
- Digital Transmission and Switching
- Communications Satellites
- Touch-Tone Telephone

The transistor *alone* transformed the world as much as any invention in history.

Ken added: “Today, you don't even need a building for that. It's probably better if you don't. We don't need to spend \$150 million on a campus. We don't need to pay to move scientists to Boston or Seattle or wherever. They can stay in their existing lab. You can hire a scientist, the lab, and all their graduate students and postdocs for a couple million bucks a year. They already have a building.

“Twenty labs for 10 years, \$400 million. You could make HUGE progress with that relatively small investment!”

And this is why I'm not looking for tens of thousands of dollars. *I'm looking for hundreds of millions of dollars.*

Is that crazy? Well, compared to what we've already spent on cancer over the last 50 years, it's minuscule.

Give us 1/500th of the money that's been spent in the last 50 years, and we'll get more done in 10 years with 0.2% of the money.

Give me a sled and a few dogs. We'll get to the pole.

Our research will not be driven by drug development. See page 8 for our 5 Rules of Funding. It will be driven by a desire to fundamentally understand what's really going on. It will be driven by the sole goal of getting to the Pole:

Cure cancer. Period.

If ten billionaires will donate 5% of their net worth to this project, we can assemble the Bell Labs of cancer. We can attract the best researchers and solve the most fundamental problems... instead of worrying about appearances.

Why the Scott Method Didn't Get Us to the Pole

Silicon Valley seems to think we'll reach the pole by going in circles faster. I'm guessing most readers will not have listened to many biotech investment pitches, but most come with an

Donate at www.evo2.org/cancer

implicit belief that developing drugs is just a cousin of designing chips. They think Moore's Law will solve biology problems: As our sequencing of the human genome grows and grows, data and knowledge will overwhelm the problem and we'll inevitably solve cancer. By the same process we'll eventually solve every human biological problem.

They believe biotech is just another version of computational tech.

The flaw in their hypothesis is the assumption that biology (cancer) is as dead as ones and zeros. They treat life itself as an *equation* to be solved.

But life is not dead! Life is volitional.

That's why the human genome project has **not delivered even 10% of what its optimistic proponents originally promised**. Why? Because genes don't control biology the way they think they do.

You can't reach the South Pole by following the North Star. We need a Bell Labs of cancer with a true pole star: **The conviction that cancer is alive and volitional**. Not dead. Not random. Not purposeless.

Biology is not computable. It's not a "hard science." It's a soft science like psychology. The human body is not an equation to be solved. You are not an algorithm. You are a self-aware being.

What about the successes that the human genome has delivered? Diseases that are caused by one mechanical failure at one identifiable spot, can be solved this way. When you can point to one mutation in a particular gene, you CAN fix it. You might call these reductionist diseases. Find the problem, fix the problem. Cystic fibrosis, tay-sachs, sickle cell disease.

If you break your arm, you know exactly where the problem is and exactly what needs to be done to heal it. Or heart disease. That's a plumbing problem. Clear the clog, problem solved.

Holistic diseases like cancer or chronic fatigue syndrome, or any autoimmune disease, are not reducible to a single mechanical point or problem.

They are diseases of **identity**. Identity diseases will never be solved with reductionist tweaks. The disease has a purpose, a goal. Therefore it will go over, under, around, or through. It'll do whatever it's gotta do to achieve its goal.

Cancer is THE crowning example. We will never solve it with computational, reductionist methods. We already tried for 50 years. We've spent a quarter trillion dollars. Why are we still whipping the dogs east when we're trying to get to the South Pole?

We need a Bell Labs of cancer.

Donate at www.evo2.org/cancer

It may sound like a big vision. \$400 million. But remember, it's a *speck* compared to the billions of dollars, decades of effort, and millions of lives lost.

Give us a sturdy sled and a team of good dogs and we'll reach the Pole.

Perry Marshall

What to Do Next

- Contribute to Science Research.
Donate at www.evo2.org/cancer
- Our [Manifesto](#) is posted online at
<https://reversingcancer.org/donation-fundraising-letter/>
The password is: now
- Our podcast is at <https://evo2.org/the-podcast/> and blog <https://reversingcancer.org/blog/>
- Contact us at: support@reversingcancer.org
- Call our CEO Jon Correll at (858) 336-3061.

We Need Your Helping Hands

Evolution 2.0 is me, CEO Jon Correll, Mary McEvoy and a few other precious volunteers to contribute hours here and there. **We can really use your hands-on assistance.**

Another thing you can do to help is fund our virus research. I know of no one who is bringing a full-fledged "Evolution 2.0" viewpoint on virus evolution. It's 501c3 not for profit, so you can go to evo2.org and make a tax-deductible donation.

We could also use some volunteers...

- **Administration and project management**
- Finances
- Scientific papers, research, and projects
- Film (documentary screenwriters, editors)
- **All** forms of marketing ad copywriting, buying Google, YouTube and Facebook traffic, writing blog posts, shooting videos, podcasts, publicity angles, news media

Email evolution@evo2.org and let us know what your skills are and how you might like to help.

Donate at www.evo2.org/cancer

5 Rules for Funding Cancer Research that May Find a Cure

The following are the 5 “80/20s” of Science Research 2.0. Our criteria for what we fund. Each eliminates 90% of suitors and multiplies our odds of success by 10X. This is why we believe we can achieve more in ten years than the government has achieved in 50, with far less money. **If you want to help win the war on cancer, this is where your money should go. Not to the IRS.**

How we invest your money	How the government wastes your money
No Drugs. We don’t fund Big Pharma drugs; a drug will never cure cancer because drugs are <i>dead</i> and cancer is <i>alive</i> . Drugs play a role, but will never be THE key that unlocks cancer.	Addicted to Drugs. The government and Big Pharma are in bed and locked into a drug development → regulation → drug funding cycle that is self-reinforcing and locks out unfamiliar ideas.
The Enemy is SMART. Evolution 2.0 is the smart cell. Life is purposeful, cancer is intentional, and maybe even self-aware. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts, so the key is discovering what defines the whole.	The Enemy is Dumb. Evolution 1.0: Nature is blind and purposeless, “monkeys with typewriters” with natural selection and blind pitiless indifference. It’s “only” chemicals. Everything reduces to its component parts.
Does it WORK? Gold standard is <u>engineering</u> : Can you build it and does it work? The legendary scientist Richard Feynman said, “That which I cannot build, I do not understand.” Action, not analysis.	Do other scientists approve? Gold standard is <u>peer review</u> : Do other scientists (who are competing for the same dollars) like it and approve of it? Studies show that 70% of science research is not even reproducible.
Challenges the SYSTEM. ALL professions are run by “good ol’ boys clubs” and become blind to their own assumptions. We believe in threatening the status quo, questioning assumptions and killing sacred cows.	Preserves the status quo. I have consulted in 300 industries. No profession is more hobbled by peer pressure, cliques and political correctness than science. Scientists spend 40% of their time lobbying for government grants. It’s impossible to get anything done.
Skin In The Game. We fund researchers, scientists and doctors who have risked careers, reputations and personal resources to sustain projects they believe in.	The Buck Stops Nowhere. Bureaucrats are shielded from all personal risk. The purpose of bureaucracy is not to accomplish anything, but to obstruct accomplishment by anyone else.

Donate Here: www.evo2.org/cancer

Donate at www.evo2.org/cancer