

Web: www.nmr.org
Email: jode7@fiscali.co.uk

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**

“Drug induced illness has become a public health menace of major and alarming proportions, producing more deaths annually than are caused by breast cancer and ranking among the top ten causes of hospital admissions.”

Medicine in Society: Volume 7 1981.

Differences of Species

“If one damages a healthy animal (in order to simulate in him a human disease), the animal will overcome the inflicted damage by its own powers, and recover naturally. But our animal researchers attribute the animal's recovery to the chemical substance they have administered – and then they are vastly surprised (presuming the matter interests them in the first place) – that this chemical substance won't heal the human patient. But the human disease was due to the fact that the immunological system has failed to act properly, and now the sick organism is being further damaged by the administered drugs. Evidently, all this is too difficult to understand for the experienced researchers, that's why they remain stuck in the stereotyped thinking and continue experimenting on animals.”

Dr Herbert Stiller M.D.,
Founder of the West German league “MDs against vivisection” 1979.

“I carried out animal experiments over many years, following an unsound logic which had been drummed into me during my studies at the university and a long time afterwards. Until one day I said to myself: something must be wrong in the thinking and practice of medicine; something basic, meaning the method is totally wrong... It would be very difficult to find anything that could be more misleading for biomedical research than animal experimentation.”

Prof. Pietro Croce, M.D.

“We demand the unconditional prohibition of all animal experiments... The public amateurishly believes in the orthodox medical fairy tale of the usefulness of animal experimentation for the art of healing, while the vivisectionists, under the pretext of serving this art of healing, perpetrate the most despicable trickery. ... We accuse the State, because it pays for the cowardly slaughter with our money and lets these people carry on their handiwork. We accuse the Church, because it pursues a head-in-the sand policy and acts as if it cannot see that public morality is undermined and destroyed through its condoning of animal experiments.”

Dr Med. Bischof, Chairman of the Association of Antivivisectionist Doctors, Austria.

Scientific Critique of Non-Human Primate Research

Why the project of the Cambridge Primate Centre in Behavioural Neuroscience (CPCBN) is scientifically irrelevant

Extracts from comments by Doctors and Lawyers for Responsible Medicine (DLRM) November 2001
(The critique was written by Dr Claude Reiss PhD).

Our board has been asked to comment on the scientific aspect of the proposed CPCBN. The comment is based on the short release from the University of Cambridge, entitled “Details of the proposed science” to take place at the CPCBN. According to this release, basic and clinical research at the projected facility should contribute to:

The understanding of the link between behaviour and the neuronal structure of the brain,
The understanding of the link between this structure and neuronal pathologies,
The development of clinical diagnosis and therapeutic strategies, the testing of drug treatment,
The understanding of how existing therapies work.

“Although not explicitly stated in the release, we suppose that the primates are considered here as models of human behaviours and pathologies. This is a frequent assumption, which is, however, false. The very idea that one species can serve as a model for a different species, demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of fundamental principles of modern biology. Any individual species is defined by its reproductive isolation, which implies that its chromosomes (genome) cannot match, complement or recombine with those of any other species. Hence each species has a uniquely designed genome, i.e. the gene structure, the control and regulation of gene expression etc. are all strictly species-specific. Since the genes determine all biological activities, it follows that the species’ physiology, its behaviour, its response to internal disorders (pathologies) or to some external stimuli (e.g. toxins), are strictly species-specific also. No species can therefore function as a biological model for another species, no matter how closely related they are in evolution...

Let us then briefly review the relevance of the five scientific priorities assigned to the CPCBN

1. the brains of thousands of animals, especially monkeys, have been explored since the 19th century to try to understand how their behaviour is embedded in this organ. Libraries are full of voluminous books detailing the very many studies. Electrodes were placed in the brain to monitor its electric activities, whilst keeping the animal awake for days, or when removing the young from her mother just after birth, etc. While the relevance to humans was already questionable – and questioned – when these experiments were performed, those results became almost overnight museum archives, when non-invasive methods (PET-, NMR-scan...) enabled the investigation of the human brain at work. Would the monkey show which part of its brain is working when doing such basic human activities as speaking, reading, writing, counting, singing? Not to speak of evolved behavioural traits like reasoning or sophisticated social attitudes. Today, no serious scientist would go back to monkey models for such investigations.”

The public have been led to believe that experiments on animals is necessary for veterinary medicine and that using them in experiments for things that are to be instrumental in the treatment of humans is helpful to animals. The truth is that the laboratory animal is not representative of the free-living animal of the same species. Diet and lifestyle are so relevant to disease and to its cure that the laboratory situation distorts the results. Therefore, one cannot generally extrapolate laboratory research results to free-living situations. For example, what relevance do an animal’s artificially destroyed kidneys have to kidneys that have degenerated through disease? The answer has to be none. The healthy tissue that remains in the experimental model is perfectly healthy and functional. The remaining tissue in degenerative disease is in a state of partial degeneration. This ‘model’ issue is even more hopeless, when trying to research into human diseases.

But it is comforting to know that not all Vets have trained using live animals. Veterinary student Andrew Knight was one of the conscientious objectors who attained his degree without resorting to vivisection. Andrew stated that by 1998 programs for students who did not wish to harm or kill animals were offered in 20 out of 31 US vet colleges and were the norm in UK vet colleges.

The Guardian Newsletter Autumn 1999 (published by Guardians, a group exposing vivisection)