

**Submission
No 284**

**INQUIRY INTO USE OF PRIMATES AND OTHER ANIMALS
IN MEDICAL RESEARCH IN NEW SOUTH WALES**

Name: Mr Patrick Murphy

Date Received: 31 March 2022

Committee Members

Inquiry into the use of primates and other animals in medical research in New South Wales
NSW Parliament House
Macquarie Street Sydney, 2000

Via submissions page:

<https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/committees/inquiries/Pages/inquiry-details.aspx?pk=2857#tab-submissions>

Submission into the use of primates and other animals in medical research in New South Wales

I am pleased to take the opportunity to make a submission for the Inquiry into the use of primates and other animals in medical research in New South Wales, as it will give me a voice against it.

As both a taxpayer and a member of the public who is aware of the ineffectiveness of animal testing, the abuse of animals in testing facilities, the waste of time and effort placed into animal testing and experimentation, not to mention the waste of taxpayer funds that are used WITHOUT any transparency, accountability or results; I strongly request you put an end to this highly secretive and unethical industry immediately.

Now I shall address the areas of concern I have in relation to the terms of reference from my perspective.

[\(a\) the nature, purpose and effectiveness of medical research being conducted on animals in New South Wales, and the potential public health risks and benefits posed by this research;](#)

Please see excerpts from “Is animal testing better than pure guesswork?”
“How Reliable Are Animal Experiments?”

“Uncovering the failure rates from animal labs”

An inquiry into animal experiments is long overdue, as there has never been a formal evaluation of animal testing.

However, there have been smaller scale statistical studies, and they make interesting reading.

Animal experiments are an established method of safety testing medical drugs. Although this was never evaluated before the method was adopted, adequate data is available. Animals of various species are used to screen drugs for potential unwanted reactions. Given that it is normal practice to use a number of species, it might be expected that if animal experiments were predictive, this method would identify potential dangers.

Animal experiments were evaluated by animal experimenters, who took six drugs, and noted which of the 78 adverse effects were detectable in dogs or rats. They ignored the effects which were undetectable in animals (e.g., headaches). Less than half (46%) of the remaining side effects were detected in the animals - slightly less than the expected results from flipping a coin [1]. In other words, animal tests were wrong 54% of the time.

With such a high failure rate, it might be expected that a high proportion of side effects caused by drugs would go unpredicted by animal tests. With this in mind, the American Food & Drug Administration (FDA) monitored all the drugs approved over a ten-year period.

Of 198 drugs monitored, 102 (52%) were re-labelled or withdrawn due to unforeseen effects [2]. As some of the side effects that were predicted would have been discovered by pre-approval human trials, the success rate of animal use can be safely assumed to be well below the 48% discovered by the FDA.

An international authority on the matter who represented the World Health Organization failed to put a figure on the success rate of standard vivisection practice when he stated: "Most adverse reactions which occur in man cannot be demonstrated, anticipated or avoided by the routine subacute and chronic toxicity experiment." [3]

Where he avoided estimating a percentage, Dr Ralph Heywood did not. As Scientific Executive of Huntingdon Research Centre (now Huntingdon Life Sciences), one of the largest animal labs in Europe concerned with screening drugs, he estimated that: "...the best guess for the correlation of adverse reactions in man and animal toxicity data is somewhere between 5% and 25%." [4]

Interestingly, his estimation of a maximum of 25% is agreed on by Dr AP Fland: 'As a very approximate estimate, for any individual drug, [only] up to twenty-five per cent of the toxic effects observed in animal studies might be expected to occur as adverse reactions in man'. [5]

But sometimes the reverse is true. Unwanted effects may be predicted by animal studies, when they do not affect humans. For example, the first chemotherapy drug, Actinomycin-D, was discovered without animal use. Later it was tried on animals and found to kill many species, including monkeys. This did not relate to humans. This is common. 45 drugs tested in 1978 were analysed. Of the side effects predicted by animal studies, 75% did not happen in humans [6].

Along with the matter of whether a drug is actually effective or not, the safety profile of a potential new drug is assessed first on animals, then progressing to human trials if successful in animals. Therefore, the success rate of animal tested drugs in humans can again be evaluated by examining the progress of these medicaments. The Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America estimate that of the drugs presented to human trials, 5% are eventually approved [7].

This is equivalent to a 95% failure rate.

The human trials are in three stages. The first trial involves healthy human volunteers, typically about 20-80.

At this stage eleven out of twelve animal-modelled drugs fail [8].

An example of this - an example which has produced statistical evidence - is the case of stroke drugs.

In the periods 1978-1988, twenty-five drugs were found to treat stroke in animals. The number that worked in humans was found to be zero [9].

This is equivalent to a 100% failure rate.

Twenty-two drugs to treat spinal cord damage were developed on animals. None worked in humans. [10]

An approach such as animal experimentation to discovering drugs can be likened to gambling. Occasionally - through sheer chance - it may give the correct result applicable to humans. But it cannot be relied on. A famous pharmacologist said on accepting a prize for his work that it is "a matter of pure luck that animal experiments lead to clinically useful drugs". He was among those who used animals for exactly that when he said this [11].

This is equivalent to a 100% failure rate.

Why don't animal methods work for predicting drug reactions? The simple answer is that animals are different. A major difference is that they suffer from different diseases to us. Less than 2% of the illnesses that can afflict humans are found in any other animal species [12]. So many of the disease's animal experimenters are trying to treat - as well as many of the conditions which may be caused as a side effect of a prospective medication - may not exist in the test animal (or any animal). Dogs get distemper, humans do not. This is also why no animals have developed AIDS in the same way that humans have.

I could provide much more evidence about this matter, but my personal time constraints have limited me in doing so, however, if you would like me to provide you many more references, I can do so.

As far the potential public health risks and benefits posed by this research goes - the rabbit hole is deep on this one, especially when you are talking about xenotransplantation.

For those of you on this inquiry who aren't aware of what xenotransplantation is, please allow me to briefly explain, via the United States FDA website:

"Xenotransplantation is any procedure that involves the transplantation, implantation or infusion into a human recipient of either (a) live cells, tissues, or organs from a nonhuman animal source, or (b) human body fluids, cells, tissues or organs that have had ex vivo contact with live nonhuman animal cells, tissues or organs. The development of xenotransplantation is, in part, driven by the fact that the demand for human organs for clinical transplantation far exceeds the supply."

This is worse than a Frankenstein experiment - at least the fictitious Dr Frankenstein performed human to human transplants, rather than pig to human transplants (usually).

There are a multitude of reasons why demand for transplantation of human organs exceeds the supply, factors like lifestyle related diseases, such as smoking, drinking, and the consumption of unhealthy foods, such as red and processed meat, eggs and dairy.

All of these lifestyle factors can be legislated out of existence as soon as the government wants it to happen; however, the political will is lacking, particularly from the Nation Party members, whose only interest is to stay in power by appeasing their voter base in rural Australia, despite the fact, these constituents are the most likely to consume these deadly products.

These same constituents are the first to complain to their local state and federal member about plant-based alternatives; claiming they are "Frankenstein food", yet they are eating way more processed food than those on a plant-based diet.

Not only that, they would be high on the list of patients likely to receive these "Frankenstein" pig organs, when they needed surgery to replace the very organs, they have ruined through their lifestyle choices. Talk about hypocritical?!

The act of Xenotransplantation is highly unnatural, as it is a cross species abomination of human interference with nature of the highest order.

Humans have evolved over millions of years (unless you are a creationist, and want to believe in non-scientific facts). To encourage xenotransplantation to continue when there is a distinct evolutionary boundary, with unknown genetic and biological scientific consequences, not to mention the highly unethical and secretive treatment of animals, bred for this purpose and hidden away in laboratories across the state and indeed, the country is akin to a mafia style code of silence.

The doctors and scientists who work in these fields are silenced, coerced by threatening with dismissal and to never be able to work in the industry in Australia again.

Using whistle-blower laws, if they show documents of their work, or photographic / video evidence of the cruelty and dissection of their test subjects.

If you try to say we are a free and democratic society, then please explain this to the public, as the answer, I'm sure, would not line up with principles of democracy.

On the subject of democracy, this brings me to another reason why we, in the western hemisphere are short of donor organs, while in China, there seems to be a much shorter waiting list.

One has to ask the question why this is the case?

If you are unaware of it, **there are organs being cut out of people, whilst they are still alive.** These people are the Falun Gong practitioners, Uyghurs, Tibetans, Muslims and Christians, in detention in China. [13, 14, 15 & 16].

This disgraceful practice is not only illegal, breaches international human rights and is clearly, highly unethical. All because the humans see themselves as the most important species on the planet, when in fact, we are the most destructive, self-centred, pests on the planet.

This government is encouraging this sort of behaviour to animals because they use the "might equals right" argument. Pretending that no other species on the planet matters more than us.

We are the cruellest primate on the planet. To continue to use animals for experimentation in unnatural ways is the height of our hubris and must be stopped.

It is clear the government is embarrassed about the animal experimentation industry, because they hide it from the public, lack transparency, lack accountability and lack ethics.

[\(b\) the costs associated with animal research, and the extent to which the New South Wales and Federal Government is commissioning and funding the importing, breeding and use of animals in medical research in New South Wales;](#)

As a taxpayer, I have a right to see how my tax dollars are being spent. For some reason this government sees it as unfit to be transparent about the taxpayer funds allocated for the use of primates and other animals in medical research.

My question to you is why? What do you have to hide?

If the truth cannot be shown, then that shows deception and culpability on behalf of the government.

Why are animals bred exclusively for use in medical research?

The scientific test methods are grossly inadequate and ineffective, as outlined above in part (a).

This comes off as one of the greatest scams and hidden secrets of the modern day.

[\(c\) the availability, effectiveness and funding for alternative approaches to animal research methods and technologies, and the ability of researchers to meet the 3 R's of Replacement, Reduction and Refinement;](#)

[\(d\) the ethical and animal welfare issues surrounding the importing, breeding and use of animals in medical research;](#)

If you would like to know about the ethical and welfare issues surrounding animals in testing, you can simply go to the humane research Australia website, there landing page asks a very simple and straightforward question - Why are animals being forced to smoke? [17]

For goodness sake! We have known for decades smoking causes a multitude of health conditions, yet for some ludicrous reason, the University of Newcastle insists on forcing mice to smoke.

There can be no scientific validity for this.

Furthermore, there are "Forced to swim tests" being carried out in universities in Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia. [18]

Below is information taken from the humane research Australia website:

The Forced Swim Test (FST) is a behavioural test conducted on animals in laboratories around the world, including Australia. It involves the dropping of a mouse or a rat into a beaker of water to observe its ability to swim, unable to escape. At first, animals panic and try to escape by attempting to climb up the sides of the beakers or even diving underwater in search of an exit. They paddle furiously, desperately trying to keep their heads above water, until eventually, they start to float.

The test is used to assess learned helplessness, which is a feature of depression-like behaviour in mice and rats. It is used in psychological studies and to test the efficacy of anti-depressant drugs.

Originally designed in the 1970s, this unscientific model is still used by some Australian universities today, including the University of Melbourne (Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health), Monash University, University of Western Australia, University of South Australia and the University of Queensland.

I insist these unnecessary, cruel and inhumane tests be stopped immediately!

(e) the adequacy of the current regulatory regime regarding the use of animals in medical research, particularly in relation to transparency and accountability;

(f) overseas developments regarding the regulation and use of animals in medical research; and

(g) any other related matters.

Due to the fact I am running out of time to make my submission, I shall provide a large body of evidentiary links for your information and follow up relating to these matters, which are below the previously referenced links.

References:

- [1] Clin Pharmacol Ther 1962; pp665-672
- [2] GAO/PEMD-90-15 FDA Drug Review: Postapproval Risks 1976-1985
- [3] Prof G Zbinden, "Applied Therapeutics", 1966, 8, pp128-133
- [4] Animal Toxicity Studies: Their relevance to man Lumley & Walker (ed) pp57-67, Quay, 1989
- [5] Dr. A. P. Fland, Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, vol.71, 1978, pp.693-696.
- [6] AP Fletcher in Proc R Soc med, 1978;71, 693-8
- [7] Reuters News Service, Dec 8, 1998
- [8] Nature Biotechnology 1998; 16:1294
- [9] Cerebrovascular Diseases 1979, Raven, p87-91
- [10] Journal of the American Paralegic Society 11;23-25, 1988
- [11] Brodie, BB, Acceptance Speech, Torald Sollman Award Meeting of the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental therapeutics, 1963.
- [12] Dr T Page "Vivisection Unveiled" p 6
- [13] Harvest - Live human organs in China - Between life and death.
<https://youtu.be/3bi92jR9nUQ>
- [14] Harvested alive - 10 year investigation of forced organ harvesting.
<https://youtu.be/CBtjRJXEzIQ>

[15] Falun Gong practitioners, Uyghurs, Tibetans, Muslims and Christians, in detention in China.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/ewelinaochab/2021/07/08/united-nations-concerned-about-organ-harvesting-in-china/>

[16] China is harvesting thousands of human organs from its Uighur Muslim minority, UN human-rights body hears

<https://www.businessinsider.com/china-harvesting-organs-of-uighur-muslims-china-tribunal-tells-un-2019-9>

[17] <https://www.humanerresearch.org.au/>

[18] <https://www.humanerresearch.org.au/forced-swim-test-at-australian-universities/>

<https://www.google.com/amp/s/aninterestingblogsquared.wordpress.com/2012/03/23/animal-experiments-did-they-ever-help-us/amp/>

<http://mrmcmed.org/Critcv.html>

or

http://mrmcmed.org/Critical_Look_Booklet.pdf

Animal Experimentation Information Online Training Session

Register here: <https://saveanimalsinlabs.info/>

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/cambridge-quarterly-of-healthcare-ethics/article/flaws-and-human-harms-of-animal-experimentation/78D1F5E6B65AE7157B7AA85FF3F06017>

https://youtu.be/4_Pn0l6ddMw

Expert opinion quotes_cancer A concise summary of the uselessness of vivisection

<https://safermedicines.org/page/>

<https://openscience.bmj.com/content/4/1/e100041.full>

https://safermedicines.org/page/faqs_faq02

<http://vivisectioninformation.com/index79a1.html>

<http://animalexperiments.info/studies/alternatives/alternatives.html>

<https://safermedicines.org/page/primates>

Systematic reviews

<http://animalexperiments.info/studies/healthcare/healthcare.html>

A non disturbing and short video

https://youtu.be/4_Pn0l6ddMw

<https://www.chronicle.com/article/A-Modern-Clinical-Trial-7/151355/>

Dr Meg Lewis of Kirkstall Ltd, The animal-free future of drug discovery' at CASJ 'Animal Research, Ethics and Public Policy' Seminar, 4 July 2013 at University of Leicester

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h5bKPa-wp7Q>