

New Survey Among Doctors Suggests Shift in Attitude Regarding Scientific Worth of Animal Testing

Los Angeles, CA - Sep 9, 2004 ([PRN](#)): Patient advocacy group, Europeans For Medical Advancement commissioned pollsters Taylor Nelson to conduct a survey of 500 General Practitioners asking their opinion on animal testing and its relevance to their practice of treating human diseases. The poll, conducted in August of 2004, revealed a significant change in attitude on the part of practicing physicians toward the traditional medical community's reliance and trust in the efficacy of animal testing.

Of the general practitioners polled:

- 82% were concerned that animal data can be misleading when applied to humans.
- 51% would have more confidence in human-based safety tests for new drugs than in animal safety tests.
- 83% would support an independent scientific evaluation of the clinical relevance of animal experimentation.

This latest poll differs dramatically with the esteemed 1989 AMA survey of Physicians Attitudes Toward The Use of Animals in Biomedical Research. The AMA survey found that 99% of active physicians in the United States believed that animal research had contributed to medical progress and 97% supported the continued use of animals for basic and clinical research (American Medical Association, Survey of Physicians' Attitudes Toward The Use of Animals In Biomedical Research, 1989, p. 8).

The Taylor Nelson poll also differs from a 1996 survey of living Nobel Laureates in medicine which found unanimous support for animal research according to a survey by Seriously Ill for Medical Research.

Medical Director of Europeans for Medical Advancement, Dr. Ray Greek, commented "The latest Taylor Nelson survey further confirms what I and others have long suspected- there is a silent majority of doctors who are well aware that animal tests are not the safety net the public and the medical profession are so frequently assured they are by the government and pharmaceutical industry."

Dr. Greek further stated "An independent, transparent and public evaluation of the scientific value of animal experimentation is long overdue. Many in the medical community have been frustrated by the establishment's refusal to debate this issue openly. We believe they must now do so in light of this survey. There is no doubt or debate that animals have been useful in the past. Today, however, we are studying disease on the molecular level and it is at that level where the differences between species occur. No longer can the animal model be of use. There is abundant evidence that testing new drugs and treatments for human disease on animals endangers human health. For example, hormone replacement therapy increases women's risk of heart

disease and stroke - research on monkeys predicted the opposite. The drug Aidsvox failed to protect 8,000 human volunteers from contracting HIV - research on chimpanzees predicted the opposite."

The Taylor Nelson survey reveals that the medical community is predisposed to an independent scientific evaluation of the clinical relevance of animal testing.

The British Medical Journal on February 28 of 2004 further conveyed the growing concern over animal testing and its efficacy in an article entitled 'Where Is The Evidence That Animal Research Benefits Humans'. The article questioned the concept that animal models are reliable for humans. Different animals react differently to drugs and diseases; therefore, making it impossible to predict how humans will react based on the animal model. This important piece and its conclusions are echoed by clinicians in the Taylor Nelson survey where 82% responded that they were concerned that animal data can be misleading when applied to humans.

Dr. Greek: "Billions of dollars are being spent on animal-based medical research while more and more people are dying every year from the same diseases they have been dying from for the past 40 years; cancer, heart disease, stroke, Alzheimer's, and Parkinson's. This new survey demands the government give full attention to this problem; the failure of the animal model to cure our most horrific human diseases."

Notes to Editor

1. Contact: Dr. Ray Greek at 310 678 9076 after 8AM Pacific time.
2. The not for profit organizations Americans For Medical Advancement, Europeans for and Japanese For Medical Advancement are patient advocacy and policy analysis groups that critique the effectiveness of biomedical research practices, appropriation and regulation. The focus is primarily on research involving animals as this is a greatly ignored area in need of analysis in addition to consuming billions in tax and charity dollars. This money should be going to more viable research modalities. We do not oppose research on animals for ethical reasons as many do, rather we think the practice is scientifically invalid and results in harm to the humans that are supposed to be the beneficiaries. Animal research also derails good treatments and needlessly adds to the cost of medications. See www.curedisease.com
3. Dr. Ray Greek is co-author of three books on the human costs of animal experiments: Sacred Cows and Golden Geese (Continuum, 2000); Specious Science (Continuum, 2002) and What Will We Do If We Don't Experiment on Animals? Medical Research for the 21st Century (Trafford, 2004).