

Web: www.nmr.org

Patron

Dr Moneim A Fadali, MD

M.Ch., F.A.C.S., F.R.C.S. (C), F.A.C.C., F.A.C.C.P

Founder

Cynthia O'Neill, S.R.N., S.C.M., Q.N., H.V.

Nurses Movement for Responsible Medicine (NMRM) was founded in October 2007 by Cynthia O'Neill, S.R.N., S.C.M., Q.N., H.V. to provide nurses with a channel through which they could express their concerns in relation to the high number of adverse drug reactions suffered by so many of their patients.

**The Objective of NMRM
is the Immediate and
Unconditional Abolition
Of All Animal Experiments
On Medical
and
Scientific Grounds**

"The extensive animal reproductive studies to which all new drugs are subjected are more in the nature of a public-relations exercise than a serious contribution to drug safety. Animal tests can never predict the actions of drugs in humans."

Professor Smithells

**Professor of Child Health and a member of the Committee on Safety of Medicines
Doctors in Britain Against Animal Experiments (DBAE) Debate.**

Animal-Orientated Medicine: The Be-All or the End-All?

"...The claims of success for animal-based research can already be refuted by one outcome: the general standard of health. When people are suffering more and more from ill health despite the billions of animal experiments carried out for their alleged "benefit", when there has for years been a three-to-four-per-cent annual increase in malignant tumours and fatal heart diseases (these currently accounting for more than two-thirds of all deaths); when there is a constant rise in the number of adults and children suffering from incurable allergies' when the cases of childhood leukaemia and other cancers are increasingly alarming; and when, with the waiting periods for certain operations growing, a sort of "class medicine" seems to be developing – then it is clear that the tests on the countless masses of involuntary animal victims have not produced any successful results."

"It is nevertheless claimed that most of the existing medical procedures were discovered through animal experiments. Such statements are untenable, for the correctly reasoning scientist can glean nothing more from his experiment than the fact that a foreign substance has, under the given conditions, produced a certain reaction in the *animal*. Any transfer of the result to the human situation is pure speculation, at best a hypothesis the practicality of which cannot be evaluated. In every case, the same experiment has to be repeated on humans, with incalculable risks and unpredictable results. An animal experiment, therefore, in no way prevents experiments on humans: in fact, because of its lack of usability, it inevitably leads to experiments on humans. Any knowledge of the reactions, effects and tolerability of substances in the human organism has only been acquired via the human being and not by means of animals. ..."

Excerpts from the address to DBAE's Second ISC, by the late Dr Werner Hartinger.

In actual fact, there is no law either in the UK or the rest of Europe that states that drugs or other substances have to be tested on animals. The law is that drugs have to be tested, but not that they have to be tested on animals. This was confirmed in 1994 by two prominent parliamentarians: Baroness Denton of Wakefield CBE, who was the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Consumer Affairs, and Charles Wardle MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Home Office. Some regulators ask for animal tests, but there is no law that states drugs and other substances have to be tested in this way. The main point is, animal experiments have proved dangerously misleading for assessing human health. Animal Experiments have led, and continue to lead, to terrible mistakes, resulting in disease and death for the human population, regardless of the ins and outs of law.

Adverse drug reactions cost the NHS £2bn

The NHS is spending nearly £2bn a year treating patients who have had an adverse reaction to drugs prescribed for them by doctors, according to new figures from the centre-left think tank Compass. ...

Sarah Boseley, Health Editor, The Guardian – 3 April 2008

“...acute toxicity from prescription medicines (Adverse Drug Reactions) stand now as the fourth leading cause of death in the EU, claiming 120,000 lives each year, a figure which could probably be doubled or even tripled if we include the longer term, or chronic, toxic effect of drugs.”

Doctors and Lawyers for Responsible Medicine (DLRM)

‘Newsletter number 9’ Summer/Autumn 2002.

“...the use of human tissue obtained during operations to remove tumours or during other brain surgery, as well as autopsy studies, resulted in the only real progress for understanding the human brain. I am about to test them on human lymphocytes and other human cell lines.”

Professor Claude Reiss

DLRM ‘Newsletter number 10’

Alternatives

But these methods should not be termed ‘alternative’; Professor Pietro Croce, explained this in the following way:

“The precise reason why we say that there is no ‘alternative’ to vivisection is that a method which aims at replacing another should share the same characteristics. But it would be difficult to find in the field of biomedical research anything as bogus, deceptive and misleading as vivisection has been in the past and continues to be in the present. That is why the methods proposed should be called ‘scientific’ and not ‘alternative’ methods.”

“Most alternative methods are based *not* on truly scientific methods such as Human cell and tissue cultures and clinical investigations of human patients, but rather on Animal cell and tissue cultures. Thus, for the so-called validation of alternative methods – a process which takes years, if ever, to complete – the researchers not only compare the data for their alternative methods with the data from animal experiments, but they also repeat the very animal experiments their alternative methods are supposed to replace, in order to obtain additional data for the purpose of further comparisons! This endless and absolutely senseless repetition of animal experiments over a period of years (despite masses of data from decades of previous animal experiments) leads neither to the reduction, nor the replacement, but rather to the perpetration of animal experiments, causing further harm to medicine and consequently the patient.”

Doctors and Lawyers for Responsible Medicine (DLRM)

“Dangerous substances would not be marketed if the smokescreen of animal research data were ruled unacceptable as evidence.”

Dr Peter Mansfield

Founder-President, Doctors in Britain Against Animal Experiments

“Truly scientific methods of biological and medical research already exist: epidemiology, computers for the construction of mathematical models, cell and tissue cultures in vitro and many others.”

Professor Pietro Croce, MD