

## Part II

4:

Early arguments against animal research were based on the obvious pain and suffering of animals in response to laboratory procedures. Research groups counter these arguments by claiming that scientific advancement is not possible without continued animal experimentation and that anesthesia is used whenever possible in order to minimize pain.

For the sake of "argument," let us assume that you must make a decision regarding the future of animal research. The question you must answer is this;

**Do the benefits produced by animal research outweigh the pain and distress animals endure, or is it absolutely wrong to conduct any animal research whatsoever?**

Vivisection is the use of animals for laboratory experiments. They are used to test medicines, cosmetics, and to study diseases so that the data can be applied to humans. Though there is nothing illegal about this type of vivisection, there is a growing ethical resistance to this practice. What ultimately must be decided is if the benefits of using animals to test experimental drugs or to research diseases in humans outweighs the distress and sometimes torture that an animal used for testing will endure in its life. Though there may have been some use for vivisection in the past, it is entirely unnecessary and unjust to continue this practice today.

In the cases of many of the animals who suffer in the name of research, life is a sad and lonely existence. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals describes this life in detail, claiming they are kept in cold, unforgiving cages, afraid, stressed, and lacking in love and compassion (PETA). Though PETA does have a stigma attached to its name, they do make valid claims. These animals are nothing more than a means to an end for the companies who experiment on them, and according to the same PETA article, "more than ninety-five percent of animals used in experiments - are not covered by even the minimal protections of the Animal Welfare Act," (PETA). In a civilized society, the use of sentient creatures for painful testing just to further its own people is an unethical and barbaric practice that has no place in modern society. All efforts should be made to find alternatives to vivisection in the scientific community.

There is also a debate surrounding the medical usefulness of vivisection. A drug or disease could present very differently in a mouse or rat than in a human, which could lead to more problems than vivisection could prevent. Charlie Callahan recalls a test involving extensive research of monkeys that caused a severe reaction when the drug was moved to human trials (Callahan 19-21). In this case, the use of monkeys as test subjects did not help in the advancement of medicine at all, and all the testing was for nothing. Experiments would be far more useful if they were done on human subjects instead of animals for this reason. There are already plenty of research groups that exist and operate on voluntary paid human testing, so

clearly it is a possibility.

In conclusion, the use of animals as involuntary test subjects is unethical and harmful to both humans and animals. The animals used in these experiments are put through enormous emotional stress and too much pain to justify using them for humanity's needs. It can also prove to be harmful to humans by using animals as a basis for medicines in the trial described previously. If it cannot accurately work in animals as it does in humans, then the animals suffer for nothing. It is time for medical research to ascend beyond the outdated use of animals as test subjects and to move to more ethical and humane sources.