

Animal testing critical analysis

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



Animal testing should be outlawed because it is hurtful and not necessary.

Tests that are performed on animals range from them being forced to ingest different household cleaning products and then monitored to see the results and new cosmetics placed on their skin to find out if there are any side effects that would be harmful to a human.

There are even some practices where animals are forced to ingest a medicine before it is put on the market to make sure that there are no life-threatening illnesses that will be caused to a human from taking the product. In order to test corrosive chemicals like Savage Acid and Goodbye Graffiti, rabbits backs are shaved and corrosive chemicals are applied onto their raw skin and left for up to two weeks. The chemicals burn the skin and the rabbits are given no pain relief. After the testing period the rabbits used are then killed. (Stop Animal Tests)

Today the term "vivisection" is used. Vivisection is defined as "cutting while still alive" but it is more commonly used today as any harmful experiment or test that is performed on an animal. Animal experimentation involves the incarceration of animals and poisoning, mutilation, disease and killing of those individuals. It is arguably the most brutal and most severe form of violence in the modern world.

The U. S. Environmental Protection Agency requires by law that pesticides be tested on dogs, who are shoved into "inhalation chambers" where they try in vain to escape the deadly poisons that are pumped in. The Food and Drug Administration requires companies marketing fluoride products to swab the teeth of 200 rats with the test substance for two weeks, at which time the

animals are killed and their heads baked in an oven for an hour and your tax dollars are funding these types of experiments.

Some businesses that test on animals include: Clorox, Clairol, Calvin Klein Cosmetics, Cover Girl, Dial Corporation, Johnson & Johnson, and Playtex Products Incorporated. It is said that an estimated 50,000 animals die due to the testing on them that Proctor and Gamble performs on them every year. " Secretly-filmed video evidence of P&G sponsored experiments at Huntingdon Life Sciences (a major multi-national contract animal testing company) shows the brutal treatment and killing of 48 monkeys." (Uncaged Campaign) However, since cosmetics and household items are not required to be tested on animals and since there are non-animal alternatives, it is difficult to understand why companies continue to conduct these cruel tests on animals. The two main reasons that all companies do not become cruelty free are: the fear for human safety and the fear of product liability suits.

Founded in 1981 was Johns Hopkins Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing (Zawistowski), a place that is dedicated to helping find new methods to replace the laboratory animals that are being tested on. The CAAT vision states: " To be a leading force in the development and use of reduction, refinement, and replacement alternatives in research, testing, and education to protect and enhance the health of the public." (Zawistowski) The main disadvantages to animal tests, according to John Frazier and Alan Goldberg, of CAAT, are: " Animal discomfort and death, species-extrapolation problems, and excessive time and expense." (Zawistowski)

Revlon Cosmetics was one of the first large companies to fund the research for alternative testing with a contribution of \$750, 000 to the Rockefeller University in 1979. (www. animalsavingsclub. com) Keep in mind that, while companies search for alternatives, animal use actually INCREASES because the old test (using animals) must be done alongside the new test (without animals) to ensure consistent results.

So what types of alternatives are being used today? The most common alternatives that are used today are: in-vitro tests, computer software, and even human “ clinical tests”. The use of animal cells, organs, and tissue cultures are also deemed as alternatives, however animal lives are still sacrificed for the use of their parts. (Stevens)

How can someone that kills a dog in the middle of a street in broad daylight have repercussions to abide by but the companies that slowly kill animals with the tests that they perform on them not have any repercussions to pay? There are laws in place for the safety of animals that are on our streets or that live with us as companions, but there are no laws that say it is wrong for businesses to slice a dog open while it is still alive with no anesthesia just to take tests of its kidney. The animals can not tell the scientist that they don't want to be tested on, but humans can. We need to talk for the animals and help stop this cruel and inhumane treatment. There are many other ways that products and medicine can be tested; the use of innocent animals is no longer needed.

Works Cited

1. Featured Cruelty-Free Company: Revlon. 2005. 17 Dec. 2005

<https://assignbuster.com/animal-testing-critical-analysis/>

2. Stevens, Karen Lee. " ALL FOR ANIMALS - Cruelty-Free Living." All for Animals. 2000. 17 Dec. 2005
3. Stop Animal Tests. 17 Dec. 2005
4. " UNCAGED CAMPAIGNS - WHO CARES WINS." Uncaged Campaign. 2005. 17 Dec. 2005
5. Zawistowski, Stephen L. Animal Use in the Lab. " The more things change..." ASPCA Animal Watch, Spring 2003, Vol. 23, No. 1. <
<http://caat.jhsph.edu/issues/aspca-animaluse.htm>>