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**Allowing Animal Clinical Trials Is Saving the Life of Humans**

“The moral cost of not doing animal research is the lives lost and the suffering that will not be alleviated because we don’t have the knowledge that comes from such research,” wrote David Jentsch (2014). Animal clinical research uses non-human animals in experiments to test the security and efficacy of medications like drugs and vaccines. Although different countries have different laws and regulations regarding animal testing, it is a popular global issue that affects millions of animals every year, and there is an increasing number of people who think animals should not be used in any clinical trials; however, scientists are still doing animal clinical trials more than usual around the world. Animal clinical trials are closely connected to everyone because people will use medicine inevitably in their daily life, whether using animals to do clinical trials decides the development of medications, and strictly implementing animal clinical trials can ensure the medication does not have deadly side effects. Medicine scientific trials should use animal subjects because animal testing is intended to guarantee medication safety; there is no other alternative technology to replace animals, and animal rights are not equal to humans.

One of the main reasons why scientific medicine trials should use animal subjects is that it ensures the safety of drugs and vaccines before they are used on humans. All medicine should pass actual human clinical trials to guarantee there will not be a vast side-effect that endangers the life of the medication user. Because animals and humans have similar biological systems, researchers have to stop the subsequent clinical trials if they find serious side effects when testing medicine on animals. Only when people pass both animal trials can scientists guarantee the medicine is safe and start the actual human trial. For instance, in 1937, a U.S. drug company produced a new elixir to treat strep throat, which had not been tested in humans or animals and turned out to be toxic, killing more than 100 people (Anthes, 2023). Furthermore, the Salk polio vaccine was put onto the market even though some animals were paralyzed to show the vaccine was unsafe; finally, ten children who got vaccinated died (Danish, 2020). The two drugs both did not pass the animal trials seriously, and this is the reason why the two tragedies happened. It is one of human history's most serious medical incidents, showing people the significance of animal clinical trials, and people must do it seriously to ensure there is no deadly side-effect. If scientists are not allowed to use animals in clinical trials, history will likely repeat itself and be even more tragic. According to Science, Medicine, and Animals (2006), society deems it unethical to use that drug or technique first in human beings since it would cause harm rather than good, so scientists should use animals to test safety first. People cannot altogether avoid the side effects of medicine; however, we can do animal testing first to ensure every mother’s child and everyone we love does not die from a tiny pill.

Another reason why scientific medicine trials should use animal subjects is that there are no alternatives or other technology to replace animals. Animals have similar living systems to humans. For instance, humans and animals both breathe air and get nutrients from food; humans and animals both get ill, among others. However, computers or artificial cells are not entirely living systems that do not have similar behavior to humans. If scientists fail in animal trials, they can see that the trialed medicine is unsafe for humans because humans and animals have similar behavior that may cause these side effects to humans too. However, if people use other technology to replace animal trials and pass the clinical trials, they cannot ensure safety because humans and machines do not have similar behaviors; there are potential side effects that can harm humans but will not be detected by machines. With biotechnology developing so fast, it seems that scientists can build a machine that can replace animals; however, the human living system is so complex that there is no possibility of using such technology to replace animals. For instance, BBC NEWS (2007) reported that US researchers have simulated mouse brains on computers, and they find it hard to simulate because a real mouse brain is thought to have about eight million neurons, and there is not enough computer memory to present these neurons. Similarly, doctors can image the brain, but they cannot see the cells, and research needs to be able to directly measure and assess the brain, which is why the mouse is required (Collier, n.d.). Both two examples show that human systems are so complex and our technology is backward; the two examples show us the complexity of a living system, and there is no other alternative since only animals have a similar living system to humans. If clinical trials on animals are banned, and medication users are killed by unreliable medicine, should people sue the unreliable machines or our conceit? Before people know everything about our bodies, we should still insist on animal trials - do not be a murderer of any life which could be saved.

The ultimate reason why scientific medicine trials should use animal subjects is that humans have precedence over animals, and there is animal welfare to ensure they not be abused. Animals have the right to live, but they should not be seen as equal to human rights. Human rights are based on an ethical principle that everyone should obey; the life right is not given by God but by ourselves since we follow the common principle. People care about animals because they are all creatures with the same mother, but animals do not follow the common principle, so the right to life of humanity differs from that of animals. For example, although people consider all creatures equal, we will not sentence a person who kills a mouse for fright to death. In human society, humans have precedence over animals. Scientific research emphasizes specific principles designed to protect individual and group interests based on broad, perceived benefits to humanity (Ferdowsian & Beck, 2011). This evidence shows us that humans have precedence over animals, and scientists are fighting for the right of humanity. Scientists did animal clinical trials intended to save more lives, the greatest and pure purpose in the world. Moreover, scientists have already studied animal welfare. There are also some regulations like the 3Rs to ensure animals are not abused; doing animal clinical trials that do not violate animal welfare is reasonable.

Someone is calling to forbid animal clinical trials because animals and humans are all creatures born on earth that should not be treated differently; since scientists did not get animals’ permission as they do with humans, they cannot force animals to take the trials. We need human permission to participate in clinical trials since they have responsibilities to themselves and know what they are doing and its consequences. However, this argument relies on an unstated assumption that animals are capable of understanding the purpose and risks of the research they are involved in. This assumption is false, or else we would need to ask for permission to eat our lunch, and every pet should be seen as a slave because we did not ask for their permission too. Because the whole assumption is false, the whole argumentative is false too. Moreover, this argument ignores the fact that animal trials are regulated by ethical guidelines and laws that ensure the welfare and protection of animals used in research; animals will not be harmed by regulated trials.

Animal clinical trials should be allowed since they ensure the safety of everyone taking medicine, and people cannot find another alternative to replace animals; furthermore, there should not be ethical concerns since humans are working on animal welfare, and doing animal clinical trials is for the interest of humanity. It is the animal clinical trials and researchers that protect us from the deadly side-effect. Only do people seriously take all clinical trials, the sacrifice by all medication trial participants will not be wasted. Animals are similar to us, and the complexity of the human body decides that animals cannot be replaced by other technologies to do clinical trials. Animals are not a part of our society; we cannot get their permission; although we cannot treat them as humans, we can remember them as a hero to science. It is not a contradiction to protect animals and allow animal testing; with more people more open to animal clinical trials, more lives will be saved.
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