

# Term paper on medical testing on animals

[Environment](#), [Animals](#)



Medical testing on animals refers to the use of animals for scientific experiments. Most of tests with animals is done by pharmaceutical companies, universities, and medical schools. Most of the animals used in laboratory tests are breed for the specific, while few animals used in the tests come from the wild. It is evident that animal medical experimentation is an ongoing discussion as whether or not it is indispensable for the survival and well-being of humanity. In any case, the sole reason for using animals in laboratory experimentation is to advance the welfare of humankind, most often ignoring the least concern for the rights of animals who sacrifice their lives I exchange for medical, household, and cosmetic product innovations. Research scientist for the Humane Society of the United States, Peggy Carson argues that most of the medical experiments with animals only spend money and time to no avail (Hayhurst 12). While proponents of medical experimentation with animals argue that experimentation with animal extend average lifespan of human life, opponents maintain that the increase in life span of human is attributed to the decline in recent epidemics (Sun 84). This paper looks at the advantages and disadvantages of medical testing on animals and developing arguments against each position. The American Medical Research maintains that using animals in medical research is essential to maintain and improve the health of human beings. They point out that practically all advances in the field of medical science in the 20th century, from organ transplant to antibiotics, is because of direct or indirect use of animals in laboratory experiments. They also maintain that animal tests hold the key to solutions to cancer, AIDS, aging, heart disease, and congenital defects. They also maintain that the use of animals in

laboratory experiments has resulted to elimination and control of infectious diseases. This has resulted to longer, better, and healthier life with much less suffering and pain (Hayhurst 54). However, proponents argue that scientists should devise other methods of research because the whole process of using animals for medical experiments remains cruel and inhumane. Animal rights activists have collected voluminous data that has led to closure of many laboratories that violate animal rights. In the past, many research labs faced subsequent closure because of minimal cruelty. Animals used in research usually undergo cruel treatment. For examples, animals captured in the wild are kept in small cages that restrict their movement and isolate them from their mates.

Proponents of Medical testing on animals also argue that animal testing helps ensure the safety of drugs and other substances that humans use or get in contact with regularly. Drugs to some extent carry greater dangers with their use but testing drugs using animals help researchers to gauge the initial safety of drugs before initial trial on human beings. Proponents assert that this reduces harm on humans as well as saving their lives, not simply from avoiding the dangers of drugs but because the drugs treat diseases and improve the quality of life. Researchers argue that the main reason for using animals in medical tests is that they consider animals similar to humans. Consequently, researchers take into account the limitations and differences but they do research on animals because they are thought to be the closest match to human beings. Even though researchers require testing of drugs to ensure that they are safe for human consumption, it is equally important to seek the consent of the test subject.

The only solution around this would involve requesting the test subjects to consent. Unfortunately, animals do not have the capacity to give consent. This brings in Emanuel Kant's categorical imperative into use. Kant argues that if preventing serious bad calls for a great deal of torture, then the act is impermissible if the aggrieved party does not consent, for example using rats in a laboratory (Rowan 29). It is evidently impermissible to use animals in Medical testing because they lack the ability to reason or consent. The only situation that may require reconsideration to that belief would be a great plague facing many species. Nevertheless, most of these types of calamities are in most case cause by human activities such as avian flu and swine flu (Rowan 29). As such, medical testing on animals is morally impossible because animals have the ability to consent. Lastly, there is an ongoing argument that drugs react differently in an animal's body and that of human. This argument further weakens the validity of medical testing on animals.

In conclusion, this paper has reviewed the pros and cons of medical testing on animals. The reality of the matter is that the practice has received acceptance as well as objection in the society because it has benefits and disadvantages. Finally, it is important to realize that majority of health problems arise from human activities and people should put more effort in preventing diseases and maintain healthy lifestyle.

### **Works Cited:**

Hayhurst, Chris. *Animal Testing: The Animal Rights Debate*. New York: The Rosen Publishing Group, 2000.

Rowan, Andrew. "Avoiding Animal Testing." *The Scientist* 25. 11 (2011): 29,

<https://assignbuster.com/term-paper-on-medical-testing-on-animals/>

29-31. ProQuest. Web. 2 June 2013.

Sun, Shany. " The Truth Behind Animal Testing." Young Scientists Journal 5. 12 (2012): 83-5. ProQuest. Web. 2 June 2013.