**COMMITTEE RESEARCH**

**Section 1:** **Topic Overview-Opinion**

*Explain your topic*

Animal testing is when people use animals for medical experiments, and research.1 This research has saved many lives and furthered doctors and scientists in their understandings of many different medical issues. It is also seen as very unethical and immoral to many people who don’t believe in the suffering of animals for our own good.Animal testing is when scientists ensure safety and the effectiveness of a product by testing it first on animals. But animal testing is also torture and suffering to the animals that are being tested on.Animal testing is experimenting with animals to help companies test their products, many animals are being injured or killed from this process

*Why does this topic interest you*

This topic interests me because everyday, millions of animals are getting tested with products, which is injuring them, and maybe even getting killed. If we can pass a “bill” to slow it down, that could be a big step towards stopping animal testing. There could be other solutions to find cures to diseases without experimenting on animals. Also, learning about animals interests us, and we want to know what is happening to the majority of them. This topic interests me because we as humans have no problem killing animals for food, so I take interest in the fact that we feel the need to step in for animal testing. It Also interests me because of how controversial it is, because it is easy to say you are against animal testing but then you look and realize how many lives the research that scientists gathered from the experiments has saved and you are not so sure. The topic is certainly not black and white in mind which makes it interesting. This topic interests me because I like learning about animals, also I wanted to learn more about the topic

This topic interests me because I like learning about animals and how I can help them. It makes me sad that lots of them are being killed everyday for testing and there is something we can do about it

*What do you think are the current controversies surrounding your topic?*

* The base of the controversy is whether animals should be used for medical purposes.
* Should these companies that are using animal testing be using something not living
* Also, if humans would not be allowed to experiment and test other humans, than should they be allowed to experiment and test on animals?2
* Is the research that has been developed and saved lives worth killing the lives of many innocent animals?1
* If animals and humans have such a similar DNA sequence then should we really consider breeding humans for the purpose of medical experiments?1
* Is humans subjecting animals to take part in their experiments, them taking advantage of their ability to dominate other species? Does humans taking part in animal testing make us just as bad as those who believe that just because you belong to a certain group you have superior moral status. 1
* Is it ethical to test on animals
* how it affects the animals being tested on
* With animal testing, millions of animals are killed to save thousands of human lives.(Killing to save lives)
* Why do we have to kill millions of animals for our daily needs.
* Animal testing costs a lot of money. We should use this money for more important events that are happening instead of murdering millions of animals.
* Is it right to breed animals just so we can kill them?
* What would happen if animals that were infected with disease to test medicine broke free?

**Section 2: Preliminary Research**

*What is the history/origin of your topic?*

Animals have been used repeatedly throughout the history of biomedical research. Early Greek physician-scientists, such as Aristotle, (384 – 322 BC)

and Erasistratus, (304 – 258 BC), performed experiments on living animals. A Greek physician in Rome also conducted animal testings to further his research in the study of anatomy. Ibn Zuhr, in the twelth century introduced animal testing as an experimental method for testing surgical procedures before applying them to human patients.3

Over the late 19th and the 20th centuries, the expansion of medical science meant that the numbers of animals used in research expanded greatly, accelerated by the Medicines Act, 1968, which provided a clearer guide to the use of animals in safety testing in the wake of the Thalidomide tragedy. The number of animals used rose to over 5.5 million in 1970 after which point the numbers began to decline rapidly. This large expansion reflected a growing medical field; animals had played a part in most medical advances of the 20th century including insulin, the polio vaccine, penicillin and the elimination of smallpox. In 1986 the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act was passed, which ensured higher animal welfare standards in laboratories

Animal testing started back in the B.C. but mainly started being used the way it is now in the 20th century.

The famous Greek doctor Galen (AD129-200) studied animals. William Harvey used animals 400 years ago to discover how blood circulated in the body. The ‘modern’ era of animal research started about 150 years ago with the rise of physiology as a science. But it was very different then - there were no anaesthetics or effective pain killers, so the animals suffered a great deal, as did patients.1

*What are the issues/problems regarding your topic?*

* Animals may suffer in the process.1
* So far there are no alternatives or it is very difficult to divise a method equally as successful as animal testing to replace the use of animals in research or testing.2
* Some may argue that animal welfare is not being protected in the lab, there are certain regulations that must be met when an animal is being used, for example there must be a vet nearby at all times, so if they need to be enforced better.2
* According to the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, 50-100 million are killed every year due to animal testing.1
* Animals are being tested to create cosmetic products when they should only be tested to find cures for diseases.1
* The process used to test animals should be conducted in the open and we should receive all of the details.1
* Animals are suffering and being killed everyday by companies trying to test their products
* Almost all of the cosmetics and medicines that we use are tested on animals, and they are being killed in that process.
* We are breeding animals just so we can kill them to try to make humans look better.
* Millions of animals die due to animal testing.
* Even if people test medicines on animals with similar DNA as humans, the medicines can still effect human differently then it did to the animals.

**Section 3: Narrow your Focus**

*As a group, which specific issue/problem will you focus on?*

As a group we want to focus on the specific issue of 50-100 million animals are dying from animal testing a year. We are going to try to pass a bill that will reduce the number of animal deaths per year down to the low millions or high thousands.

Preamble: To lower the number of animal deaths per year,to create more regulations when treating animals for tests.

 To ban all cosmetics testing on animals in the US.

**Section 4: Supportive Evidence**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of evidence** | **Supportive Facts** | **Significance** | **Citation** |
| existing legislation | The Animal Welfare Act is a federal law that addresses the standard of care animals receive at research facilities. Yet, it excludes roughly 95% of the animals tested upon including rats, mice, birds, fish, and reptiles. | This shows that some of the animals have absolutely no rights when being tested which is why we must pass a bill to help further protect their rights.  | [http://aldf.org/resources/when-you-witness-animal-cruelty/animal-testing-and-the-](http://aldf.org/resources/when-you-witness-animal-cruelty/animal-testing-and-the-law/) |
| research results | According to the company Lush, testing animals is not the only way to get our research, using 3-dimensional human skin models can fully replace the use of rabbits for skin irritation testing, and cell culture tests for sunlight-induced “photo”-toxicity, genetic mutations, and other harmful effects. These are all alternatives to animal testing. | Using different alternatives for animal testing will help lower the number of animals used for animal testing and overall the animals killed in the process. | [https://www.lushusa.com/Still-Fighting-Against-Animal-Testing/about-animal-introduction,en\_US,pg.html](https://www.lushusa.com/Still-Fighting-Against-Animal-Testing/about-animal-introduction%2Cen_US%2Cpg.html)s |
| Statistics | 95% of drugs fail in human trials despite promising results in animal tests  | This shows that they can kill the animals and it might not even work on humans | <https://www.crueltyfreeinternational.org/why-we-do-it/arguments-against-animal-testing> |
| Statistics/studies | * Out of 93 dangerous drug side effects, only 19% could have been predicted by animal tests, a recent study found
 | This shows that not all side affects of a drug would affect animals | <https://www.crueltyfreeinternational.org/why-we-do-it/arguments-against-animal-testing> |
| polls/surveys | In a poll taken in 2011, surveys showed that 67% of Americans believe companies should not test products like cosmetics and dish soap on animals, and 60% are more likely to buy products that were not tested on animals. | This is important because our bill will represent what the people want. | <http://aavs.org/animals-science/how-animals-are-used/testing/> |
| statistics | Not only are time, money and animals’ lives being wasted (with a huge amount of suffering), but effective treatments are being mistakenly discarded and harmful treatments are getting through. The support for animal testing is based largely on anecdote and is not backed up, we believe, by the scientific evidence that is out there.95% of these animals are not making it. | Some animal testing isn't actually useful at all and it's just unnecessary and people aren't taking the animals lives seriously  | <https://www.crueltyfreeinternational.org/why-we-do-it/arguments-against-animal-testing> |
| Constitutional connection | Animal testing companies are capturing them, holding them in tiny cages, even subjecting them to artificial whiplash--to see what happens. This is unconstitutional because the animals must be treated fairly | the animals are being tortured with no mercy | [http://web.b.ebscohost.com/pov/detail/detail?vid=1&sid=52139bd1-399d-4b38-8a05-512a80247912%40sessionmgr112&hid=107&bdata=JnNpdGU9cG92LWxpdmU%3d#AN=23236881&db=](http://web.b.ebscohost.com/pov/detail/detail?vid=1&sid=52139bd1-399d-4b38-8a05-512a80247912%40sessionmgr112&hid=107&bdata=JnNpdGU9cG92LWxpdmU%3d#AN=23236881&db=pwh) |
| Research Results | Paul Furlong, Professor of Clinical Neuroimaging at Aston University (UK), states that "it's very hard to create an animal model that even equates closely to what we're trying to achieve in the human." | This shows that testing on animals doesn’t help show how a drug will affect the people that take the drug | <http://animal-testing.procon.org/> |
| court case | Pacheco found 17 monkeys living in tiny wire cages that were caked with years of accumulated feces. A rotting stench permeated the air of the cramped, dungeon-like room. | Animals are put in terrible conditions and might die before testing because of it. | <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-experimentation/silver-spring-monkeys/> |
| Statistics | According to the book, animals rights, is states “Anti-cruelty laws notwithstanding, we still slaughter some 10 billion animals for food...we hunt 200 million animals annually, and kill another 20 million in research and testing.” | This shows that every year, the USA kills over 10 billion animals every year for our needs and wants.  | Animal Rights by William Dudley |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statistics | “A recent survey indicates that 54% of the public believes that it is unacceptable for chimpanzees to undergo research which causes them to suffer for human benefit while 65% say it is unacceptable to kill the animals for research.” | This shows us that not only do the people not accept animals testing, but most people that use animals testing are murdering them for research. | Animal Rights by william Dudley |
| **research results** |  There are sufficient existing safety data as well as *in vitro* alternatives to make animal testing for cosmetic and household products obsolete. Unfortunately, many companies remain resistant to changing their testing techniques. | Their are other options than animal testing that companies should be, but are not utilizing.  | <http://aavs.org/animals-science/how-animals-are-used/testing/> |
| **research results** | There are 13 types of animal tests currently being performed. 11 out of that 13 are killed after being tested on or given something scientists know will kill them. Most of these types are also unreliable because animals can react differently to the chemicals we give them than a human would. | We cannot not take innocent animal lives if the tests aren’t even reliable. | [**http://aavs.org/animals-science/how-animals-are-used/testing/**](http://aavs.org/animals-science/how-animals-are-used/testing/) |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Article** | 800 animals are tested for products before a drug is determined to be safe | This questions whether animal testing that is being done today is efficient and whether there are other ways to test animals | **Is Animal Testing Morally Justified** |
| **Article** | “Researchers subject rodents to burns, electric shocks or other painful experiences in order to examine how similar traumas could affect humans” | These animals suffer like humans and should not be tested on  | **Is Animal Testing Morally Justified** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Article** | Animal Welfare Act does not cover mice, rats and birds | This shows that there are loopholes and all animals need to be protected | **Is Animal Testing Morally Justified** |
| **Article** | “The USDA breaks down its data by three categories of pain type: animals that experience pain during their use in research but are given drugs to alleviate it (339,769 animals in 2010); animals who experience pain and are not given drugs (97,123); and animals who do not experience pain and are not given drugs (697,801).” | This shows us that when people use animal testing, their are three different types of pain categories. This shows us that 436, 392 animals that are used in animal testing are feeling pain when they are being tested on.  | **ProCon.org****Should animals be used for scientific or commercial testing?** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Article** | “Animals used in chemical testing - always alive and fully conscious - are never given pain relief” | Animals need to be protected because they are experiencing pain | **Is Animal Testing Morally Justified** |
| **statistic** | “Public support for animal testing has been in steady decline since the 1950s, dropping from above 90 percent in 1949 to only 57 percent in 2013” | This shows that the people are against animal testing | **Is Animal Testing Morally Justified** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Article | “According to Humane Society, International, animals used in experiments are commonly subjected to force feeding, forced inhalation, food and water deprivation, prolonged periods of physical restraint, the infliction of burns and other wounds to study the healing process, the infliction of pain to study its effects and remedies, and "killing by carbon dioxide asphyxiation, neck-breaking, decapitation, or other means." | This shows us that due to testing, animals being tested on are suffering major pain or are being forced to inhale a substance. This is cruel and unusual punishment for the animals. | ProCon.orgShould animals be used for scientific or commercial trading? |
| existing legislation | There is no legal requirement for the inspection of federally-owned and operated research facilities. The USDA has no jurisdiction over facilities using animals not covered under the AWA. | There are way too many exceptions to who is covered by the Animal Welfare Act and the AWA only covers less than 10% of animals used in labs. All animals in all labs should be protected.  | <http://www.neavs.org/research/laws> |
| existing legislation | However, the AWA provides only [minimal protection](http://www.releasechimps.org/harm-suffering/myth-of-humane-treatment/#axzz1RFhLyld0) for certain species while excluding others such as rats, mice, and birds bred for research—who together constitute an estimated 90-95% of animals in laboratories. | 90-95% of animals used in labs are bred for that purpose, and are treated differently from animals not bred for tests. They need to be treated the same and provided more protection. | <http://www.neavs.org/research/laws> |
| existing legislation | With just 115 USDA inspectors to oversee more than 7,750 licensed facilities involved in research, exhibition, breeding, or dealing of animals, adequate inspection and regulation is impossible. | The Animal Welfare Act is not properly being enforced even for animals that are protected by the Animal Welfare Act. | <http://www.neavs.org/research/laws> |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Article | “Alternative testing is frequently more cost and time efficient.” | Animal testing should not be done because alternative testing is more cost effective | Alternative Testing Cannot Replace Animal Experimentation |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Article | “Overwhelming evidence demonstrates that animal tests are dangerous to human health, and may be the reason that so many ‘safety tested’ drugs cause so many side effecgts. | This shows that the animal testing is not effective. | Animal Experimentation Hampers Medical Reserach |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **examples** | In 2004 a 10-year-old chimpanzee named Dover died from overheating. The USDA fined Yerkes a trivial $1,375 for negligence leading to Dover’s death. In 2008, maximum fines under the AWA were increased from $2,500 per violation to $10,000, but for facilities bringing in millions of dollars from animal research, these fines are simply the cost of doing business. | Fines need to be increased greatly because they have simply become a part of bussiness, and teach labs who violate the little regulations we have to suffer nothing. | <http://www.neavs.org/research/laws> |

**Section 5: Opposing Evidence**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of evidence** | **Opposing Facts** | **Significance** | **Citation** |
| statistics | The California Biomedical Research Association states that nearly every medical breakthrough in the last 100 years has resulted directly from research using animals. | We may be killing animals using animal testing but we are also risking the lives of countless people by not usiing animal testing. | <http://animal-testing.procon.org> |
| Court cases | Lee Barlett sold a drug that he claimed would cure diabetes, it killed hundreds of people who took it, because it was never tested in a lab to animals prior to marketing. | The drug being tested by animal could have saved hundreds of people. | <http://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/WhatWeDo/History/Overviews/ucm304485.htm> |
| statistics | many valuable drugs and medical procedures derived through such research are responsible for saving 70% of human lives using things that were tested by animals | animal testing is saving human lives and has a major benefit  | http://web.b.ebscohost.com/pov/detail/detail?vid=http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2002-04-07/news/0204060071\_1\_animal-immune-system-research1&sid=52139bd1-399d-4b38-8a05-512a80247912%40sessionmgr112&hid=107&bdata=JnNpdGU9cG92LWxpdmU%3d#AN=23236881&db= |
| Article  | “Governments routinely require that new drugs be tested on animals before they are marketed. Furthermore, replacement tests like computer simulations cannot reproduce the complexity of human genetics.” | This shows that there are no alternatives to animal testing because computer tests are not the same as a human body.  | Alternative Testing Cannot Replace Animal Experimentation |
| Research results | The California Biomedical Research Association states that nearly every medical breakthrough in the last 100 years has resulted directly from research using animals. | This shows that animal testing can help to make sure a drug will work properly | <http://animal-testing.procon.org/.> |
| research results | Thanks to research on animals leading to the development of Highly Active Anti-Retroviral Therapies (HAART), AIDS is no longer the death sentence it was 30 years ago | Animal testing is lowering the amount of deaths from AIDS because of the animal testing scientists are doing to try to cure it. | <http://www.understandinganimalresearch.org.uk/about-us/science-action-network/forty-reasons-why-we-need-animals-in-research/> |
| Statistics | Millions of animals would have died from distemper, rabies, leukemia, tetanus, infectious hepatitis virus, parvo or anthrax. Animal treatments that were developed using animal testing also include remedies for glaucoma and hip dysplasia, as well as pacemakers for heart disease. Moreover, animal testing has also been instrumental in saving endangered species from extinction. Aside from all of these breakthroughs for animals, the method also helped produce medicines for humans. Thus, it should also be the same with animal testing on cosmetics. | This shows that not only does animal testing benefit humans, it also could benefit the animals being tested on | <http://greengarageblog.org/12-pros-and-cons-of-animal-testing-on-cosmetics>  |
| statistics | Animal research is responsible for the development of asthma inhalers; asthma still kills around 2,000 people in the UK every year. | Many people are suffering from asthma and animal testing is helping save those people | <http://www.understandinganimalresearch.org.uk/about-us/science-action-network/forty-reasons-why-we-need-animals-in-research/> |
| Statistics | “The polio vaccine, tested on animals, reduced the global occurrence of the disease from 350,000 cases in 1988 to 223 cases in 2012” | This shows us that with animal testing, it helped reduce the disease, polio, which was on a global level. Without the testing, we would've never been able to help that many people | ProCon.orgShould animals be used for scientific or commercial testing? |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Article** | **“Animal Testing method do not yet compare to testing on a live animal.”** | **Shows that animal testing is the only way to do it** | **Is Animal Testing Morally Justified** |
| Statistics | Chris Abee, Director of the University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center's animal research facility, states that "we wouldn't have a vaccine for hepatitis B without chimpanzees," and says that the use of chimps is "our best hope" for finding a vaccine for Hepatitis C, a disease that kills 15,000 people every year in the United States | With testing, we save thousands of lives that we wouldn’t of been able to save. Testing allows us to go to point where we can test vaccines and see if they would really work on infected people that lives are at stake. | ProCon.orgShould animals be used for scientific or commercial testing? |
| Statistic | “In 2006, infant mortality in the USA - a key indicator of the nation’s health was measured at fewer than seven deaths per 1,000 live births compared to 47 deaths per 1,000 live births in 1940.” | This shows that the knowledge game from animal testing | **Is Animal Testing Morally Justified** |
| Statistics | “Chimpanzees share 99% of their DNA with humans, and mice are 98% genetically similar to humans...Because animals and humans are so biologically similar, they are susceptible to many of the same conditions and illnesses, including heart disease, cancer, and diabetes.” | Since Chimpanzees and mice share almost the same amount of DNA with humans, when we test them with products, the results that we get are almost always how that product would affect humans. Without testing them, we probably would of never been able to get vaccines and cures to diseases. | ProCon.orgShould animals be used for scientific or commercial testing? |
| Article | FDA recommends animal testing | This approved by the government | **Is Animal Testing Morally Justified** |
| Article | “Ample regulations are in place, they assert to protect animals from unnecessary pain and suffering.” | This shows that the animals are protected. | **Is Animal Testing Morally Justified** |
| Article | Animal Welfare Act established in 1966 set standards to reduce animal pain  | This shows that there are methods in place to help the animals to make sure that they do not suffer | **Is Animal Testing Morally Justified** |
| Article | If vaccines were not tested on animals, millions of animals would have died from rabies, distemper, feline leukemia, infectious hepatitis virus, tetanus, anthrax, and canine parvo virus | This means that even though we test animals for vaccines, if the vaccines work, then we actually save millions of animals lives. | ProCon.orgShould animals be used for scientific or commercial trading? |
| research result | Foreign companies distributing their products to China must also have them tested on animals. | The U.S. would lose bussiness with China if many of our goods are required to be tested other ways, but not on animals. | <http://animal-testing.procon.org> |
| article | If vaccines were not tested on animals, millions of animals would have died from rabies, distemper, feline leukemia, infectious hepatitis virus, tetanus, anthrax, and canine parvo virus. | Animals aren’t getting nothing out of the tests, the tests have also saved millions of animal lives. | <http://animal-testing.procon.org> |
| current events | If thalidomide had been properly tested on pregnant animals, its potential for causing severe birth defects would have been discovered before the drug became legal for human use. | Animal testing is needed to prevent endangering people who are sold the products. | <http://animal-testing.procon.org> |

**Section 6 & 7: Supportive and Opposing Arguments**—

***Cite your sources***

 Katrina Leigh

**Main Argument**: All animals should be protected under the law.

Citation: "Testing." *American AntiVivisection Society*. American Anti-Vivisection Society, 2016. Web. 02 Mar. 2016.

Evidence: The AWA provides only [minimal protection](http://www.releasechimps.org/harm-suffering/myth-of-humane-treatment/#axzz1RFhLyld0) for certain species while excluding others such as rats, mice, and birds bred for research—who together constitute an estimated 90-95% of animals in laboratories.

Evidence: There is no legal requirement for the inspection of federally-owned and operated research facilities. The USDA has no jurisdiction over facilities using animals not covered under the AWA.

Evidence: Federally-owned facilities, like the Department of Defense, are not inspected by the USDA–which is the agency charged with enforcing the AWA through the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS).

**Main Argument**: For many types of animal testing, the tests are not reliable.

Citation: "Testing." *American AntiVivisection Society*. American Anti-Vivisection Society, 2016. Web. 02 Mar. 2016.

Evidence: The Draize eye test has been criticized for several reasons. The structure of the cornea of the eye of a rabbit differs significantly from that of a human. Rabbits also produce a smaller volume of tears than humans, allowing chemicals and other irritants placed in rabbit eyes to linger longer and cause more irritation.

Evidence: Due to differences in the anatomy and structure of the skin of differing species, using animal data to determine skin irritation on humans is often inapplicable.

Evidence: There are differences in the structure of the skin of rats and humans (Dermal Penetration), which can lead to unreliable data for these tests.

**Main Argument**: Sales for businesses will also improve from our bill, which will be representing the people.

Citation: "More Than a Makeup Trend: New Survey Shows 72 Percent of Americans Oppose Testing Cosmetics Products on Animals." *The Physicians Committee*. The Physicians Committee, 31 Oct. 2011. Web. 02 Mar. 2016.

Evidence: In a poll taken in 2011, surveys showed that 67% of Americans believe companies should not test products like cosmetics and dish soap on animals, and 60% are more likely to buy products that were not tested on animals.

Evidence: Consumers answer the question: How likely would you be to purchase a cosmetic or personal care product if it were not tested on animals? 58% answered likely.

Evidence: Consumers answered the question: Do you think cosmetic and personal care companies should be allowed to test their products on animals? 61% said no.

**Section 7: Opposing Arguments**—***Cite your sources***

**Citation:** "Animal Testing - ProCon.org." *Should Animals Be Used for Scientific or Commercial Testing?* ProCon.org, 10 Dec. 2015. Web. 02 Mar. 2016.

 **Main Argument**: Animal testing benefits humans and animals.

Evidence: If vaccines were not tested on animals, millions of animals would have died from rabies, distemper, feline leukemia, infectious hepatitis virus, tetanus, anthrax, and canine parvo virus.

Evidence: Treatments for animals developed using animal testing also include pacemakers for heart disease and remedies for glaucoma and hip dysplasia.

Evidence: Virtually every major medical advance of the last 100 years has depended on research with animals.

**Section 6 & 7: Supportive and Opposing Arguments**—

***Cite your sources***

Dani Pritikin

**Main Argument**: Animals should not be traumatized before or after the testing.

Evidence: “Animals are getting harmed and traumatized in the conditions they are put in and the unnecessary harm. This is causing animals to die with out even testing them!”

“These animals are put in places where it is nearly impossible to survive. Companies need to be thinking about the animals lives too. The animals were put through this torture for no reason.”

“Animals in labs live stressful, monotonous, and unnatural lives of daily confinement and deprivation.”

**Main Argument**: Most animal testing ends in failure

Evidence: “92 out of every 100 drugs that pass animal tests fail in humans.”

“For every makeup product you use, an animal could have died for that.”

“Smoking was thought non-carcinogenic because smoking-related cancer is difficult to reproduce in lab animals. Many continued to smoke and to die from cancer.”

**Main Argument**: Money is being wasted because of animal testing.

Evidence: “More Than $12 Billion in Taxpayer Money Wasted Annually on Animal Testing”

“One professor at the Oregon Health and Science University got $9.5 million in grants in the last few years to test the effects of obesity and diabetes on monkeys.”

“animal testing ethically and scientifically unsound, it’s financially unsound.”

**Section 7: Opposing Arguments**—***Cite your sources***

**Main Argument**: Animals help cosmetics be safer.

Evidence: “Animals are a big help in seeing if a certain cosmetic can work and keeps harm from cosmetic users.”

“Animals can see whether the product works or not before the product goes into stores.”

“Without the animal testing stores could be selling things

that are harmful to humans.”

**Section 6 & 7: Supportive and Opposing Arguments**—

***Cite your sources***

Alec Raz

 **Main Argument**: Most animal testing doesn’t even help the drugs heal what they are trying to

Evidence: “Out of 93 dangerous drug side effects, only 19% could have been predicted by animal tests, a recent study found” says [crueltyfreeinternational.org](https://www.crueltyfreeinternational.org/why-we-do-it/arguments-against-animal-testing)

“95% of drugs fail in human trials despite promising results in animal tests” states [crueltyfreeinternational.org](https://www.crueltyfreeinternational.org/why-we-do-it/arguments-against-animal-testing)

In an interview with Paul Furlong [procon.org](http://animal-testing.procon.org/) Furlong states, “it's very hard to create an animal model that even equates closely to what we're trying to achieve in the human."

**Main Argument**: It’s animal cruelty

Evidence: [procon.org](http://animal-testing.procon.org/) states “animals used in experiments are commonly subjected to force feeding, forced inhalation, food and water deprivation, prolonged periods of physical restraint, the infliction of burns and other wounds to study the healing process”

[procon.org](http://animal-testing.procon.org/) says, “ testing, such as studying cell cultures in a petri dish, can produce more relevant results than animal testing because human cells can be used”

[procon.org](http://animal-testing.procon.org/) shows “95% of animals used in experiments are not protected by the Animal Welfare Act.”

**Main Argument**: There are many better alternatives

Evidence: [crueltyfreeinternational.org](https://www.crueltyfreeinternational.org/why-we-do-it/alternatives-animal-testing) says “Almost every type of human and animal cell can be grown in the laboratory. Scientists have even managed to coax cells to grow into 3D structures, such as miniature human organs, which can provide a more realistic way to test new therapies. ”

[crueltyfreeinternational.org](https://www.crueltyfreeinternational.org/why-we-do-it/alternatives-animal-testing) also states “Both healthy and diseased tissues donated from human volunteers can provide a more relevant way of studying human biology and disease than animal testing.”

[crueltyfreeinternational.org](https://www.crueltyfreeinternational.org/why-we-do-it/alternatives-animal-testing) says, “With the growing sophistication of computers, the ability to ‘model’ or replicate aspects of the human body is ever more possible.”

**Section 7: Opposing Arguments**—***Cite your sources***

**Main Argument**: It can help the animals

Evidence:

“Moreover, animal testing has also been instrumental in saving endangered species from extinction.” says [greengarageblog.org](http://greengarageblog.org/12-pros-and-cons-of-animal-testing-on-cosmetics)

 [procon.org](http://animal-testing.procon.org/) says “ Research animals are cared for by veterinarians, husbandry specialists, and animal health technicians to ensure their well-being”

“If the product or drug has beneficial properties, then the animal may receive these benefits in a healthy way. They can be treated for their injury, and they can even come out of the clutches of death depending on the severity of their injury or illness.” states [nlcatp.org](http://nlcatp.org/6-major-pros-and-cons-of-animal-research/)

**Section 6 & 7: Supportive and Opposing Arguments**—

***Cite your sources***

Jason Garrod

**Main Argument**: Animals should not be harmed for cosmetics.

Evidence:

 “The world doesn’t need another eyeliner, hand soap, food ingredient, drug for erectile dysfunction, or pesticide so badly that it should come at the expense of animals’ lives.” http://www.peta.org/blog/top-five-reasons-stop-animal-testing/

“Today, there are alternatives for the most commonly required safety tests for cosmetics” Bill to Ban Animal Testing for Cosmetics in the United States Introduced

“Moreover, there are thousands established ingredients that are “Generally Recognized as Safe”(GRAS), and therefore do not require further testing. There are, for example, almost 20,000 ingredients in the European Union’s database for which safety data is already available. Bill to Ban Animal Testing for Cosmetics in the United States Introduced

“Numerous cosmetic companies - including major brands such as Aveda and The Body Shop - have pledged to not use animals to test their products. Such moves, many observers believe, have been influenced in part by the public’s growing discomfort for animal testing… Cosmetic companies have developed a variety of alternative methods to test their products… Researchers have also begun to develop alternative methods of testing pharmaceuticals, including the creation of synthetic human organs. Is animal testing morally justified

**Main Argument**: Animals should not be harmed if there are other methods to test products and drugs.

Evidence:

“Alternative testing is frequently more cost and time efficient.”Animal testing should not be done because alternative testing is more cost effective Alternative Testing Cannot Replace Animal Experimentation

“The setting of specific deadlines represented the necessary line in the sand that drove the development, acceptance and utilization of non-animal tests. Such tests have typically proven to be cheaper, quicker, and better at predicting human reactions than the antiquated animal tests first developed 70 years ago.” Bill to Ban Animal Testing for Cosmetics in the United States Introduced

“Pharmaceutical companies can use a “chemosyntheic liver”- a substance that acts as a stand- in for a group of enzymes found in the liver - to ensure that their drugs are not toxic. Other researchers are using new technology known as “organ-on-a-chip”,which simulates human organs by integrating human cells with microchips that pump blood through the cells. Scientists have already created a “lung-on-a-chip” journalist Erin Biba noted in Popular Science in 2013, and are working on chips that will simulate bone marrow, the heart and the brain.” Is animal testing morally justified

**Main Argument**: Animal testing is not full proof

Evidence:

“Overwhelming evidence demonstrates that animal tests are dangerous to human health, and may be the reason that so many ‘safety tested’ drugs cause so many side effects”Animal Experimentation Hampers Medical Reserach

800 animals are tested for products before a drug is determined to be safe. This questions whether animal testing that is being done today is efficient and whether there are other ways to test animals. **Is Animal Testing Morally Justified**

“Opponents further claim that animal testing is not as effective as its supporters claim. Current testing methods are intended to evaluate how chemicals such as those found in consumer products might harm humans and the environment… But they rely heavily on the use of animals, a faulty approach considering animal tests have never been scientifically proven to predict human outcomes.”**Is Animal Testing Morally Justified**

**Section 7: Opposing Arguments**—***Cite your sources***

Main Argument: There are measures in place to make sure that animals do not suffer because nothing compares to animal testing

Evidence:

“Ample regulations are in place, they assert to protect animals from unnecessary pain and suffering.” **Animal Testing Morally Justified**

Animal Welfare Act established in 1966 set standards to reduce animal pain **Is Animal Testing Morally Justified**

“Federal laws and regulations on animal research, proponents maintain, are sufficient to ensure that animals are treated as well as possible during testing. Due to such laws, States United for Biomedical Research, a network of nonprofit associations that promotes science, notes on its website, animal comfort is addressed from birth through shipping, housing and feeding, the duration of research study and the animal’s death.” I**s Animal Testing Morally Justified**

 “Governments routinely require that new drugs be tested on animals before they are marketed. Furthermore, replacement tests like computer simulations cannot reproduce the complexity of human genetics.”Alternative Testing Cannot Replace Animal Experimentation
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**Section 6 & 7: Supportive and Opposing Arguments**—

***Cite your sources***

Megan Tappe

 **Main Argument**: Animals go through a lot of suffering due to animals testing.

Evidence:

|  |
| --- |
| “According to Humane Society, International, animals used in experiments are commonly subjected to force feeding, forced inhalation, food and water deprivation, prolonged periods of physical restraint, the infliction of burns and other wounds to study the healing process, the infliction of pain to study its effects and remedies, and "killing by carbon dioxide asphyxiation, neck-breaking, decapitation, or other means." |

ProCon.org/Should animals be used for scientific or commercial trading?

On top of the deprivation, there are the experiments. U.S. law allows animals to be burned, shocked, poisoned, isolated, starved, drowned, addicted to drugs, and brain-damaged. No experiment, no matter how painful or trivial, is prohibited – and pain-killers are not required. Even when alternatives to the use of animals are available, the law does not require that they be used—and often they aren’t.

Peta.org/Cruelty to animals in laboratories

After three dogs were forced to ingest a test substance every day for five days at Charles River Laboratories, they experienced labored breathing and a high heart rate. They became cold to the touch, were not able to be aroused and were seen with the test substance in their mouths and on their bodies. One dog died and the other two were euthanized one to two days later.

Many animals are being cruelly tested on, and sometimes, animals don’t even get pain killers to relive the pain. It is also unfair that even when animals do survive the test, they have to be killed after, or being killed in the process.

**Main Argument**: Drugs that pass animal testing are not always safe.

Evidence:

|  |
| --- |
| Animal tests on the arthritis drug Vioxx showed that it had a protective effect on the hearts of mice, yet the drug went on to cause more than 27,000 heart attacks and sudden cardiac deaths before being pulled from the market. |

 Even when they tested the product on the animals, the product still was not safe for human use

ProCon.org/Should animals be used for scientific or commercial trading?

People, in general, have longer life expectancies than most nonhuman species, metabolize substances differently, and are exposed to a multitude of different environmental factors over our lifetimes. Diseases that develop in people differ in significant ways from artificially imposed symptoms or in animals that have been genetically engineered. The claim that animals can accurately predict human response is false, as today we know that miniscule differences in genes and their regulatory mechanisms within the human species make it difficult to foresee drug response in different people.

This shows that even with animal testing, the products that they test on are not going to have 100% results.

Navs.org/The failure of animal model

Many drugs that appear safe and effective in animals fail in humans, or cause significant harm, and even death. A 2004 study from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration found that 92 percent of drugs entering clinical trials following animal testing fail to be approved. Of those approved, half are withdrawn or relabeled due to severe or lethal adverse effects not detected during animal tests.

This shows that even if we use animal testing, the results could be wrong, or deadly. Animals might have a different affect on the product than humans, but even with animal testing, we would never know the difference.

**Main Argument**: The government wastes a lot of money on animal testing

|  |
| --- |
| A two-species lifetime cancer study can cost from $2 million to $4 million, and the US National Institutes of Health (NIH) spends $14 billion of its $31 billion annual budget on animal research. |

ProCon.org/Should animals be used for scientific or commercial trading?

This shows us that the government spends almost half of their annual budget on animal testing, when that money could be used on something else that is helpful.

USA spends **$16 billion** dollars annually for animal testing at tax payers' expense and is subject to massive waste and mismanagement of taxpayers' dollars. Much of this cruelty is supported by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), which allocates 40% of its annual research budget to animal experiments.

In order to fund for animal testing, the people must fund for it, using their taxes. Most of the NIH’s budget is going towards animal testing, and it is not right.

Change.org/Reduction of animal testing to reduce governments waste at tax payers’ expense.

Over a HALF MILLION dollars in STIMULUS money was spent on monkey business:

"A Fox 4 investigation has one lawmaker taking action after we discovered the government is using more than a half-million dollars in stimulus money - money meant for saving and creating jobs - to buy monkeys for flu vaccine experiments." NOT a single job was created.

Change.org/reduction of animal testing o reduce governments waste at tax payers’ expense

The money that they get from taxes, is meant to pay for and create jobs. During this process, not one single job was created, and over half million dollars were spent on finding a cure for the flu.

**Section 7: Opposing Arguments**—***Cite your sources***

**Main Argument**: Testing saves thousands of lives that without the testing would of been lost due to diseases

Evidence:

|  |
| --- |
| Chris Abee, Director of the University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center's animal research facility, states that "we wouldn't have a vaccine for hepatitis B without chimpanzees," and says that the use of chimps is "our best hope" for finding a vaccine for Hepatitis C, a disease that kills 15,000 people every year in the United States |

ProCon.org/Should animals be used for scientific or commercial trading?

Without testing, we would of never been able to save those lives. We owe it to the animals that helped make that happen.

The California Biomedical Research Association states that nearly every medical breakthrough in the last 100 years has resulted directly from research using animals.

ProCon.org/Should animals be used for scientific or commercial trading?

This is proof that through the past 100 years, every vaccines that we have ever came up with was to the thanks of animal testing. Without it, a lot of lives would’ve been lost.

The polio vaccine, tested on animals, reduced the global occurrence of the disease from 350,000 cases in 1988 to 223 cases in 2012.

PoCon.org/Should animals be used for scientific or commercial trading?

With animal testing, it had reduced to amount of polio disease from 350,000 to 223. That is 349,997 people who had been cured due to the vaccine that scientist were able to find because of animal testing.
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