

# MP BRIEFING SHEET

## ANIMAL TESTING VALIDATION

### Challenging Standard Replies & Restoring Democratic Oversight

**How to use this sheet:** When you write to your MP, you will often receive a standardised “copy-and-paste” reply. This briefing equips you to politely but firmly dismantle those responses, expose the lack of legislative oversight since 2002, and demand your MP fulfils their democratic duty as an elected representative. Use it alongside the Definitive Campaign Video.

### KEY FACTS AT A GLANCE

- **4 May 2023 FOI Response (UK Medical Research Council):** No evidence or documentation exists of foundational scientific validation for the overall process of animal testing as a predictor of human outcomes.
- **Over 90% failure rate:** Drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials due to lack of efficacy or unexpected toxicity.
- **No Parliamentary Select Committee inquiry** into this framework since **2002** — a 24-year gap despite massive scientific advances.
- The system was **codified into law** (Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986) based on custom and practice, never on rigorous, unified scientific validation of the paradigm itself.

### THE DEMOCRATIC PROBLEM

MPs are elected to scrutinise legislation and ensure policy is evidence-based. On animal research, however, standard replies show total reliance on pre-written civil service statements rather than active oversight. The public, via FOI requests, has uncovered what Parliament has failed to examine for nearly a quarter of a century. This is a clear failure of legislative scrutiny.

### COUNTERING STANDARD MP REPLIES

**Standard Reply 1: “The Government is committed to the 3Rs and animal testing is only used as a last resort when no validated alternative exists.”**

***How to respond politely:***

Thank them for supporting the 3Rs, then pivot: “I welcome your support for the 3Rs. However, the UK Medical Research Council confirmed on 4 May 2023 that there is **no foundational scientific validation** for animal testing as a whole. Why are modern human-relevant methods (organs-on-a-chip, AI modelling, advanced cell cultures) forced to meet near-perfect validation standards, while the animal testing framework — with its documented 90%+ human translation failure rate — operates on unvalidated custom and legal inheritance?”

**Standard Reply 2: “Animal testing is legally mandated to ensure human safety before clinical trials.”**

***How to respond politely:***

Remind them that law should follow science, not protect outdated practice: “Regulations must be based on current evidence, not historical custom. Holding onto a framework with a 90%+ failure rate as a supposed ‘safety filter’ creates a dangerous bottleneck that delays effective treatments for patients. Will you challenge this regulatory inertia and support modern, human-specific technologies that are already held to rigorous validation standards?”

**Standard Reply 3: “Animal testing remains necessary for medical progress and patient safety.”****How to respond politely:**

Point to the evidence of failure and superior alternatives: “If animal testing were truly essential, we would not see a 90% failure rate in translation to humans. The most rigorous validation today is happening in human-relevant New Approach Methodologies. As my MP, will you push for increased funding and regulatory support for these superior, human-specific technologies instead of defending a system that has never been foundationally validated?”

**SPECIFIC ACTION DEMANDS FOR YOUR MP**

Do not just argue — give your MP concrete legislative actions they can take. Copy and adapt the wording below:

**1. Table a Parliamentary Question**

Ask the Secretary of State for Science, Innovation and Technology: “When did the Government last commission an independent scientific audit comparing the predictive value of animal models with modern New Approach Methodologies (NAMs) for human outcomes?”

**2. Call for a New Select Committee Inquiry**

Contact the Chair of the relevant Select Committee (Science, Innovation and Technology or Health) and request a formal inquiry into animal testing validation versus human-relevant alternatives, noting the 24-year gap since the last dedicated review in 2002.

**3. Support Increased Funding for NAMs**

Ask them to support and vote for increased government funding and infrastructure for organ-on-a-chip, AI-driven modelling, and advanced human cell culture technologies — the methods that are already demonstrating superior human relevance.

**4. Raise the Issue in Westminster Hall or Debate**

Request that your MP raises the lack of foundational validation and the 24-year oversight gap during any relevant debate or in a Westminster Hall debate on science and research policy.

**SAMPLE FOLLOW-UP PARAGRAPH (copy & adapt)**

“Thank you for your reply. I am writing as one of your constituents who is deeply concerned about the lack of foundational scientific validation for animal testing. The MRC confirmed in May 2023 that no such validation exists. Given that Parliament has not conducted a Select Committee review of this framework since 2002, I would be grateful if you could [table the Parliamentary Question / call for a new inquiry / support increased NAMs funding] as outlined in the attached briefing. I have also shared the Definitive Campaign Video on this issue and would welcome the opportunity to discuss it further.”

**Together, with thousands of campaigners, we can restore proper democratic oversight and accelerate the shift to kinder, more effective, human-relevant science.**

Please watch and share the Definitive Campaign Video, then use this briefing when writing to your MP.  
I'm Linda Birr-Pixton — and I'm proud to stand with you for real change.