

Tom Lonsdale Veterinary Surgeon

PO Box 6096
Windsor Delivery Centre
NSW 2756
Australia

Phone: +61 2 4574-0537
Fax: +61 2 4578-1384
E-mail: tom@rawmeatybones.com
Web: www.rawmeatybones.com

10 June 2010

Duncan Maskell
Head of Department and
Marks & Spencer Professor of Farm Animal Health, Food Science & Food Safety,
Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Cambridge,
Madingley Road,
Cambridge
CB3 0ES

Dear Duncan,

Many thanks for frank response putting your cards on the table.

I can tell that you are taken aback and wanting to know more. It seems to me that we all start somewhere and this may be the start of an exhilarating journey for you. I hope so.

Please find below intercalated responses to your 7 June 2010 email intended to illuminate and state plainly what I believe to be key elements requiring resolution.

I hope that you will come back to me or my associates with questions and comments so that we can progress what I believe to be the single biggest issue facing the veterinary profession in the 21st Century.

All the best,

Tom

.....

DM:

Date: 07 Jun 2010 09:20:57 +0100
From: Duncan Maskell <djm47@cam.ac.uk>
To: Tom Lonsdale <tom@rawmeatybones.com>
Subject: Re: 380 vets want enquiry

Dear Tom,

Thank you for your email.

I am not a veterinarian, though I sit on RCVS Council and Head the Cambridge Veterinary School.

TL: Terrific to be speaking with you.

DM: I therefore have a somewhat detached lay person's view of the veterinary profession and many of the scientific issues underpinning it.

TL: Excellent. How much do you know about raw meaty bones? Have you read and re-read *Raw Meaty Bones* as per Alison Tyler's recommendations? <http://www.rawmeatybones.com/alison Tyler.php>

DM: I am a microbiologist and have published nearly 200 papers in peer-reviewed journals, books etc.

TL: Marvellous. It will be interesting to hear about your specific researches as they may apply to the current discussion. Of course there's immense opportunity for extensive new research as we get this renaissance underway.

Are you interested in paradigm shifts? [Professor Lynn Margulis](#), renowned microbiologist and co-evolution expert was the first to recommend I write *Raw Meaty Bones* (her handwritten letter to me is one of my most treasured possessions).

Prof Margulis was enthralled by her reading of [Pet Foods' Insidious Consequence \(A Modern Veterinary Snafu\)](#) and [Cybernetic Hypothesis of Periodontal Disease in Mammalian Carnivores](#).

DM: I Chair the RCVS Research Sub-Committee.

TL: Excellent, especially since almost the entire edifice of small animal vet medicine is flawed and needing overhaul or demolition. The sinister aspect to this is that despite the alarm bells having been sounded almost 20 years ago incompetent and corrupt research continues to be the norm.

Following our agitations the Australian Veterinary Association (AVA) reluctantly paid for a literature research into [Diet and disease in companion animals](#). Although mostly restricted to a review of the association between diet and periodontal disease. When providing commentary on the review, the AVA wrote:

Those investigating small animal health problems should also take diet and diet consistency into account when researching systemic diseases — possible confounding effects of diet and poor oral health must be considered in such studies. (*RMB* p 30)

No studies take account of diet and poor oral health (unless you employ semantic gymnastics). In fact when Prof Colin Harvey, one of only two vet periodontists in the world, wanted to do a simple study of the diet/periodontal connection he was specifically banned.

DM: I am also a member of the General Advisory Committee on Science at the UK Food Standards Agency.

TL: Brilliant. Because this is about huge issues, spanning disciplines and having a major influence on matters scientific and dietary affecting humans. Trying not to be cryptic: Now that we've, what I believe, cracked the carnivore code, we are in a strong position to understand what's happening for human omnivores. Science is often easier to perform at the extremes where background 'noise' is restricted to a minimum. That's the case with our study of carnivores with their more restricted nutrient and food texture requirements. Reapplying that knowledge for the omnivores in the middle of the spectrum allows us a clearer view.

Should bear in mind that force feeding a world population of pet carnivores on junk food provides us with immense volumes of data in our own living rooms.

DM: I therefore think that I am justified in considering myself a scientist with a high international reputation,

TL: Marvellous, agreed. Excellent starting point and I'm enthusiastic. I'm hopeful we can have insightful and useful dialogue leading to massive benefits for pets, people and the planet.

DM: though animal nutrition is clearly not one of my strengths!

TL: No matter, because this is only partially about animal nutrition. Animal health and nutrition provides a vehicle for the narrative in *Raw Meaty Bones* — a bit like farm animals provide the vehicle for political commentary in *Animal Farm*. But *Raw Meaty Bones* is more about introducing new modes of thinking about science and our tenure on this planet at this advanced period in the Age of Mammals.

Since a good deal, probably most, clinical small animal vet science does not pass the laugh test, then we need to not only be concerned about the disastrous information circulating as current veterinary

orthodoxy, but we need to be concerned about orthodox methodology and orthodox practice and administration of that orthodoxy.

Another wonderful supporter of *Raw Meaty Bones* the book is climate change expert [James Lovelock FRS](#), author of the *Gaia Hypothesis*. I was especially fortunate that James Lovelock proofread *RMB* Chapters 10 and 14. His quote at the beginning of Chapter 10 is especially apt for vet science: ‘Science has taken over from religion and it has become a rather corrupt church. It’s in its mediaeval theological phase.’

[DM: I am very disturbed by your comments about corruption in the veterinary profession.](#)

TL: Although from the very inception we’ve been blowing the whistle on vet corruption, until now we’ve not used the specific term in our writings. Since the beginning in Australian Veterinary Association and Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons elections about 9% of vets have endorsed my stand on vet corruption. This time, however, we’ve used such terms as ‘corrupt veterinary establishment’ and ‘prostitution’. Despite the risk such terms may have offended some voters; it was a risk worth taking. Now 380 vets, in full unmistakable knowledge, endorse the allegations as being true and appropriate. If a handful of vets made such allegations the RCVS would be obliged to investigate. 380 vets cannot be ignored.

[DM: I have worked in the pharmaceutical industry, in small biotechs, and in various University Departments, including the Institute of Molecular Medicine at Oxford, so I have a broad experience of scientists, medics and vets.](#)

TL: Yes, but James Lovelock’s statement about the mediaeval is still apt. Whilst scientists, medics and vets (and I could include dentists) are the ones most able to understand the challenge of the new, they are also the ones who are able to filibuster and obstruct. The literature is replete with pioneers who were ostracised and ridiculed by the established order — some burnt at the stake others stoned to death for heresy.

[DM: There are always black sheep in any profession, but in my experience the veterinary profession is populated by honest people who are most definitely not corrupt.](#)

TL: Actually we don’t need to trade blows over this matter of semantics. And yes, there are at least 380 honest vets. But my experience and that of most pet owners I know is that vets corruptly misuse their knowledge and corruptly fail to play by the rules. Anyone who lives in a modern society knows that fresh wholesome food is best for people. But vets insist on the opposite being true for pets. Any vet who sees a bend in the road acts on the available evidence and turns the steering wheel to negotiate the bend. The same vets when confronted with bountiful evidence of pets resurrected by a natural diet, but previously written off as incurable, simply change the subject and continue to browbeat the owners for employing the curative diet.

However, it’s not the rank and file of vets who I condemn for allowing their hind brain to control their behaviour; it’s the upper echelons. It’s the vet authorities in the RCVS, the vet schools and associations whose privilege, power and responsibility it was to discover, research and disseminate the information in *Raw Meaty Bones*, but who in fact have done their utmost to prevent that information reaching a vulnerable public and their animals.

In your ensuing discussions on this subject please observe carefully the fanciful and absurd arguments mounted by the vets you speak with. Watch their displacement behaviour; see how they prevaricate and for want of a better word; see how they ‘cheat and lie’. (Unfortunately, I’m not at liberty to tell you which eminent vet said that the majority of vets cheat and lie.)

[DM: I consider your comments about the veterinary profession being corrupt as being highly defamatory,](#)

TL: Not sure it’s possible to defame a profession — but all allegations backed up by the truth. Seven lawyers, including two top flight defamation lawyers, helped me edit the text of *RMB*. We agreed that several passages were defamatory yet should be included since they were true and plain speaking is essential to our understanding and resolution of serious malfeasance.

DM: unworthy, and of course counter-productive to your cause

TL: You may be right, but nearly 20 years of campaigning has not been productive, regardless of the words used, the manner and place of their explication. We now ramp-up the rhetoric. What have we got to lose?

DM: if you really are interested in promoting your view of what pet animals should be eating.

TL: As mentioned pet diets is mainly the vehicle, albeit an important vehicle. There's much more important stuff that's at the heart of the message. Having spent nearly twenty years and £hundreds of thousands without success, I'm always interested in finding an easier, cheaper way.

DM: Your conspiracy theory that money given by industry corrupts education at the UK veterinary schools is simply completely and utterly wrong-headed.

TL: Here, we are reading the evidence differently. [Prof Sandra Scarr](#) can tell you more about pet food influence in US vet schools, having done a full Freedom of Information survey of those schools. It's the same the world over. Rest assured that not only the recipients of the money, but the whole school and all other researchers are extremely loathe to do work that calls into question any aspect of the sponsor's business. As mentioned earlier, no research takes account of diet and oral health — except where they seek to fabricate evidence that bones are dangerous and likely to break teeth.

The climate of fear runs throughout the institutions. Everyone (as far as I can see) is tight lipped and engaged in self-censorship.

DM: I can only speak for Cambridge, but the idea that an institution as venerable as this one, with its tradition of complete academic freedom, could be bought off for a few quid given by a pet food company is fantasy and frankly insulting.

TL: When pet-food companies endow specific programs and activities, they generally control how they are run. As an example, please see Cambridge's co-hosting of the Waltham (Mars Inc.) Nutrition Symposium. <http://www.walthamsymposium.com/>
How much do you think it's worth to Mars Inc., the world's biggest poisoner of pets, to be associated with a venerable institution with its tradition of complete academic freedom? But in any event it's not just the money in brown paper bags, the whole system is geared up for pets to get sick as a result of consuming junk food and for vets to diagnose and treat the pets without ever questioning the magnitude of the epidemic and why it arises. Just a pat of approval is all that it takes to keep vets doing what they do within the junk pet food/vet/fake animal welfare culture.

DM: You will note that my Chair is endowed by Marks and Spencer, so I have some direct experience of this kind of conspiracy theory thinking.

TL: OK, do you know the discussions that took place in the M & S board room when they calculated whether or not to fund your chair? What innocence by association may they gain by associating with Cambridge? Just asking because I do not, offhand, know what skeletons may lurk in the M&S closet.

DM: I am someone who values my academic freedom above all else, actually. I made this point when I was appointed to this Chair, and I have never shied away from being critical of the retail food industry when necessary.

TL: I cast no aspersions about your personal values or of the committee who appointed you. You do, of course, have innumerable opportunities to be critical of the food industry in all its guises.

DM: Indeed I wrote a letter to the *Guardian* newspaper not so long ago, in response to a mud-slinging article that they had published, making it clear that it was insulting and wrong-headed to assume that just because something is endowed by a commercial company then being supported by that endowment means that the incumbent is somehow in thrall to the endower.

TL: If universities accept commercial funds to endow chairs, for example, the test of independence from commercial control include no influence on the selection of the chair's incumbent and no

influence on the chaired professor's research, teaching, and consulting activities. Indeed, there are many such independent, endowed chairs at leading universities.

Chairs endowed by pet food companies in veterinary schools and animal science departments do not appear to be independent from commercial influences. Royal Canin's (now owned by Mars) endowment of the small animal nutrition program at the University of Guelph (Canada) is an example of commercial control of, or at least strong influence on, selection of a chaired professor and the direction of the incumbent's research and teaching. The contract between the University and Royal Canin stipulates the company's participation in committees to select the professor and to review his/her research program. Royal Canin is permitted, by contract, to withdraw financial support if not pleased with the endowed professor's and the small animal program's performance. In other words, Royal Canin controls the small animal program at the University of Guelph Veterinary School.

Closer to home you can find Freedom of Information reports on several UK vet schools' dealings with junk pet food companies at: <http://www.ukrmb.co.uk/showcontent.toy?contentid=162360>

The correspondence between [The Royal Dick School of Veterinary Studies and Pedigree Master Foods, Crown Petfoods and Ralston Purina International \(UK\) Ltd](#) is especially troubling.

As an aside would you happily do without the M&S money and still pursue your research agenda? Of immediate relevance, would you spend 20 years and £hundreds of thousands if you thought something was important and needed to be studied and disseminated?

DM: I am not very well up to speed with the science under-pinning the view that raw meaty bones are better for pets to eat than commercial pet food.

TL: That's OK. I hope that you will remedy that in the coming months. There's plenty of info at www.rawmeatybones.com and in the books. Hopefully you will engage with my associates to help gauge the level of interest and commitment to this subject.

DM: What I have seen is unconvincing.

TL: That's a shame. Have you read Professor Richard Malik's assessment of the importance, purely from the vet clinical perspective, of this information? Please also note the comments of the former Directors of the Sydney University, Post Graduate Foundation in Veterinary Science: <http://www.rawmeatybones.com/vetsay.php>

DM: I am also intrigued that pet animals are living longer than ever before, with higher quality of life,

TL: I'm afraid that's an oft repeated untruth deriving from the junk pet-food propaganda mill. Rather than re-hash or abridge existing information, I've appended a post from the recent discussions at www.vetsurgeon.org carried out in the lead-up to the RCVS elections.

DM: and I do not understand how this can be the case if commercial pet food is as bad for the animals as you suggest.

TL: The full extent of the harm done will only be understood when the veterinary profession stops its stupid (nay corrupt) denial that there's a problem and stops the defence of the indefensible. In the meantime, though, there are 389 pages of *RMB* that should help with the understanding.

DM: I am sure that you will have confronted this argument, and I look forward to hearing your refutation.

TL: Thanks. I hope that the above comments and the post below and your further reading help you in the quest for answers. Please let me know your suggestions for the future.

All the best,

Tom

Post from the Rotten Callous Venal Sham Elections thread at www.vetsurgeon.org. May also be viewed more readily at: <http://www.rawmeatybones.com/RCVS/RCVS2010.php> under 'Forum discussion'

G'day Arlo,

Thanks for your observations. As a non-vet you can be forgiven for misunderstandings. Although I would recommend that you take care about your sources of information. It appears that you've paid little or no attention to what [Roger Meacock](#), [Richard Allport](#) and I've been saying; have not found time to read *Raw Meaty Bones* and *Work Wonders* and I doubt if you've spoken with [Professor Richard Malik](#) and other commentators of integrity.

Arlo Guthrie said: Let's face it, pets are living longer and healthier lives,

Are they? Whoever told you that? Where is their evidence? (And I mean published evidence, not the marketing spiel of junk pet food outfits and their vet flunkies.)

Theoretically, of course, I accept that the junk food makers may have ironed out some of the problems encountered in junk foods of, say, fifty years ago. That's not surprising since they've been flat out trying to obscure and resolve the known litany of problems whilst continuing their disgraceful fraud.

And if you wish to create straw men [and then blow them away] and say today's junk foods are better than a bread and water diet (inadequate protein), an all meat diet (insufficient calcium), a liver diet (too much vitamin A), a vegetable diet (no taurine) or all manner of other diets concocted by unknowing owners, then you may have a (meaningless) point.

But please don't begin to suggest that junk food fed animals live longer and healthier lives than their raw meaty bones fed counterparts.

Lippert and Sapy compared longevity of dogs fed table scraps against those fed junk food from the can or packet ([see papers top right hand side](#)). Yup, junk food fed dogs died on average at 10.4 years. Table scraps enabled pet dogs to live to 13.1 years.

In 2009 [Professor Richard Malik](#), highly regarded feline medicine expert, went all the way to Brazil to tell the [2009 WSAVA conference about the DECREASE in health and thus life expectancy of cats fed junk food](#).

Malik says:

Re-emergence of the View That 'Natural' Foods Are Necessary

In the 1990s, a group of veterinarians (e.g., Dr Tom Lonsdale) helped remind our profession and the general public that cats were obligate carnivores, and that they did better when fed more "natural" food such as chicken wings, drumsticks, lamb shanks, chunks of uncut red meat, and the like.

Although there was a strong emphasis on texture in relation to periodontal health, the "raw meaty bones lobby" provided cogent arguments that fresh meat by-products "on the bone", containing skin and connective tissues, were also an important source of micronutrients. Food was eaten slowly and with effort, rather than being gulped down. Presumably this results in a lesser post-prandial alkaline tide. There is more tenacity about possession of food when such diets are provided, and without doubt cats are more satisfied at the completion of a "natural meal".

Effort extended in chewing, gnawing and consuming the ration provides exercise for the gums, periodontium and masticatory muscles (and indeed for the whole cat). The natural self-cleaning action of stripping flesh from bone reduces tartar accumulation and promotes good gingival and oral cavity hygiene. Even tearing apart long strips or chunks of meat achieves this end.

And well might Professor Malik say these things.

My research (both published and unpublished) and that of thousands of others confirms that the sick are cured and the healthy remain healthy if four simple steps are followed:

- i.) Abide by the first rule of medicine. 'First do no harm'. Stop the junk food. About an 80% improvement in health arises.
- ii.) Fix up any periodontal problems surgically as indicated.
- iii.) Feed whole carcasses or raw meaty bones.
- iv.) Stand back in amazement and ask, 'Why didn't the vet/vet school/RCVS tell me this?'

Arlo, it's a no-brainer. Sick animals live shorter more miserable lives. Why do you think [Professor of Psychology, Professor Sandra Scarr](#) says on [her blog](#):

The unholy alliance of pet food companies, veterinarians, and animal welfare groups (who also depend on pet food companies for funding) is costing pet owners worldwide billions of dollars in diet-caused illnesses and causing immeasurable suffering and premature deaths for millions of pets. This money-driven cabal has to be exposed and stopped.

Do you suggest that Professor Scarr has lost her marbles? According to you, she should switch her Labrador breeding kennel back to junk food quick smart.

Arlo Guthrie said: In any event, I doubt it is possible to conduct robust research which proves conclusively that the benefits of RMB outweigh the benefits / ills of commercial food.

Now I know you haven't read *Raw Meaty Bones* or *Work Wonders* and are therefore short on information, however this statement of yours really does leave you badly exposed.

First, there is NO PUBLISHED LONGITUDINAL RESEARCH that demonstrates junk food even remotely compares with, let alone outweighs the benefits of a natural diet.

Second, it's as easy as falling off a log to show the difference between the health and well being of animals fed junk food and those fed RMB. Just try reading *Raw Meaty Bones* and *Work Wonders* (with an open mind) and you'll be supplied with all the information you require.

Actually, you might like to publish book reviews, the very thing the corrupt vet journals refuse to do.

All the best,

Tom



Date: 17 Jun 2010 07:43
To: Duncan Maskell <djm47@cam.ac.uk>
From: Tom Lonsdale <tom@rawmeatybones.com>
Subject: Fwd: Re: 380 vets want enquiry
Cc: Sandra Scarr

G'day Duncan,

Just checking to see if you received the email and attachment OK.

Prof Scarr and I were discussing the enormity of the situation where, 20 years after the whistle was blown, the vet profession is still massively incompetent and in many instances corrupt. Prof Scarr proposes to write to you in due course. Meanwhile I would appreciate to hear your thoughts on the evidence we present and the best way forward.

Thanks and best wishes,

Tom

Date: 25 Jun 2010 09:09
To: Duncan Maskell <djm47@cam.ac.uk>
From: Tom Lonsdale <tom@rawmeatybones.com>
Subject: Fwd: Re: 380 vets want enquiry
Cc: DEBS_WICKHAM, Susan_Morecroft ...snip... Thomson, Sandra Scarr, Jie Yahoo

G'day Duncan,

Another week has slipped by and still no response to my letter of 10 June.

Previously you remarked that you were 'not very well up to speed with the science'. Given the magnitude of the issues, that comes as a surprise. However, I believe that you have now been furnished with sufficient information -- which I suggest is validated by the 380 vote at the RCVS Elections and the comments by eminent vets at <http://www.rawmeatybones.com/vetsay.php>.

As Head of the Cambridge Veterinary School and in your other official roles, I suspect that you are bound by ethical, intellectual and legal obligations.

Please, as a matter of urgency, indicate what steps you propose to take in light of the evidence of widespread incompetence and corruption within the UK veterinary schools and wider veterinary profession.

Thanks and best wishes,

Tom

Date: 25 Jun 2010 07:09:31 +0100
From: Duncan Maskell <djm47@cam.ac.uk>
To: Tom Lonsdale <tom@rawmeatybones.com>
Cc: Sandra Scarr <SandraScar@aol.com>
Subject: Re: Fwd: Re: 380 vets want enquiry

Dear Tom,

I got your email thanks. Sorry I didn't answer immediately but other stuff gets in the way.

In terms of the competency of the veterinary profession I am not well able to comment in detail as I am not a veterinary surgeon. I do, however, have a lot of happy customers leaving our clinic with animals that are in a lot better shape than they were when they came here.

I think that your accusation of corruption is absurd and defamatory to the vast majority, as I said before.

I followed up on some of your colleagues, and saw one of them on the internet with a presentation on the power of homeopathy. I have no truck with this kind of quackery. The RCVS, along with other Royal Colleges, was born at a time when there was a desire to regulate practitioners to stop them practising quack medicine. I wish it exercised these powers more strongly.

I am not prepared to enter into any more correspondence with you. I do not accept your arguments, I strongly support the scientific approach to medicine and veterinary medicine, and I think that it is a disgrace that you continue to defame your profession.

Duncan

Duncan Maskell
Head of Department and
Marks & Spencer Professor of Farm Animal Health, Food Science & Food Safety,
Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Cambridge,
Madingley Road,
Cambridge
CB3 0ES

Telephone: 01223 339868

Fax: 01223 337671