

Animal testing is  
cruelty and it is  
abusive



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Is animal testing cruelty or science? This is the question that many people ask to themselves, and is one of the many controversial topics in today's society. In my point of view animal testing is cruelty because animals can't talk for themselves so they get kill and hurt, and we also violated their right by doing this. Anjo a member of the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) said " Animals feel pain; they have a right to decent life" (Nancy Day 2000, pg. 12). It is difficult to determine how many animals are used for research, but experts agree the number is declining. Research use animal for experiments because animals' bodies often react in ways that are similar to the ways in which human bodies react. Animal research proponents say that almost every major medical discovery in the last hundred years has involved experiments on animals. " Jonathan Balcombe of the Humance Society of the United States estimates that between 15 to 20 million vertebrate animals are currently used each year in the United State and between 60 and 80 million are used worldwide" (Nancy Day 2000, pg. 13). According to Chris DeRose, founder and president of Last Chance for Animals said, " I'd give my own life to cure cancer. I don't, morally and ethically, however, have the right to kill a single rat; I don't care what preposterous justification they try to use? "(Nancy Day 2000, pg. 14). Many animal activists are opposed to animal experimentation on moral ground because by getting animal for experimentation we are violating their right. Animal research proponents say the morality is in saving human lives. They point to the millions of people whose lives have been saved or improved through research on animal. Between these two positions, influenced by tides of public opinions, government regulation, cultural differences, and ethical considerations. Most people agree that some guidelines or regulations should control animal

experimentation. Peggy Carlson, a physician in the Washington D. C. area and a research scientist for the Humane Society in the United State, “ As an emergency room physician I often see the suffering of patients ill and dying from diseases that could have been avoided if more resources were devoted to prevention, if healthier dietary guidelines were advocated, and if more research applicable to humans was conducted. I also know that behind this human suffering is another level of suffering, more hidden from view: the suffering of animals used in costly and needless experiments that benefit no one”( Vaughan Monamy 2009, pg. 29 ). Peggy Carlson concluded that the practice of using animals for experimentation to mimic or to study human diseases is often unreliable and occasionally misleads scientific investigation. Not only that but million and billions of dollars are wasted in animal experimentation. Animals are used in experiments for three general purposes: to find out how biological systems function or what factors affect behavior; to educate and train students in medicine and science; and to test drugs, chemicals, or products to determine their safety and effectiveness. Neal Barnard said, “ Animal tests have caused a very substantial loss, in terms of loss of money, in terms of the loss of good minds being devoted to a very, very limited methodology, and in terms of indicating that certain things are true which weren’t true”( Chris Hayhurst 2000, pg. 27). One alternative to using animals for medical experimentation is to use human beings instead. If this seems shocking, keep in mind that human experimentation is already a very large and important part of medical research today. Many scientist claims that people are living longer because of animal experimentation, but studies have shown this to be false. “ Researcher in Boston and Harvard University’s found that medical measures (drug and <https://assignbuster.com/animal-testing-is-cruelty-and-it-is-abusive/>

vaccines) accounted for at most between 1 and 3.5 percent of the total decline in mortality in the United States since 1900. The researchers noted that the increase in life expectancy is primarily due to the decline in killer epidemics, such as tuberculosis, scarlet fever, smallpox, and diphtheria. The facts about these infectious diseases are that they were declining before and in most cases long before specific therapies became available. The decline of these diseases was most likely due to such factors as improvement in sanitation, hygiene, diet and standard of living" (Vaughan Monamy 2009, pg. 50). However, medical research has played an important role in improving people's lives without animal experimentation. "The list of advances made without the use of animals is extensive and includes the isolation of AIDS virus, the discovery of penicillin and anesthetics, the identification of human blood types, the need for certain vitamins and the development of X-rays. The identification of risk factors for heart disease and probably one of the most important, the discovery for decreasing death from heart attacks was made through human population studies" (Nancy Day 2000, pg. 58). As we see in the previous paragraph many medical solutions were found without conducting animal experimentation. I also found that this discovery was more accurate and less expensive compared to animal experimentation. One of the major problems with animal experiments is that the results frequently do not apply to humans. Irwin Bross, Ph. D., former director of biostatistics at the Roswell Institute for Cancer Research testified before congress in 1981 that "while conflicting animal results have often delayed and hampered advances in the war on cancer, they have never produced a single substantial advance either in the prevention or treatment of human cancer." (Nancy Day 2000, pg. 45) Animal tests that attempt to predict which

substances cause human cancer have also been shown to be unreliable. If studies have shown that the experimentation on animal has shown to be unreliable why does scientist keep wasting their time killing innocent animal. Instead they should try to find difference source that could help find a solution to cancer. When I was researching, I found that neurological diseases are another major cause of death and disabilities in the United States. Again, animal experimentation in this area has not correlated well with human diseases. In 1990 an editorial in the Journal Stroke noted that 25 compounds that have being proven effective for treating stroke in animal models over the last 10 year have not proven to be effective for the use in human's strokes. Stephen Kaufman, M. D., reviewed animals model of such degenerative neurological disease as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's and conclude that " animal models designed to improve our understanding and treatment of these condition have had little impact and their future value is highly dubious"(Chris Hayhurst 2000, pg. 20). According to the International League of the Right of animals; " all animals are born with an equal claim on life, are entitled to respectful treatment, and have the right to live freely in their natural environment. " Some people refused to accept that animals have rights because animals cannot reason, write, speak, or create art, just because of these their life deserve less consideration than human lives" (Nancy Day 2000, pg. 72). However, according to Tom L. Beauchamp, " research indicates that many animals exhibit the same types of mental capabilities as humans" (Nancy Day 2000, pg. 74). Chimpanzee provide excellent example of animal intelligence. The fact that chimpanzee can use tools, recognize and decode symbols, and perform tasks on command proves that the distinction between people and animals is dubious at the best. " It is <https://assignbuster.com/animal-testing-is-cruelty-and-it-is-abusive/>

clear that animals are intelligent beings, but it is not necessary that they have intelligence in order to be worthy of rights. If a creature's moral significance depends on the intelligence, then people with little potential for intelligence — brain damaged humans, the mentally retarded, or the comatose would not be worthy of the same consideration as fully functional humans" (Chris Hayhurst 2000, pg. 81). All human and nonhuman life, regardless of its intelligence, is unified by one important quality: animals, like humans, possess the capacity to suffer. Despite whether animals have intellectual abilities, it is impossible to argue that animals do not feel pain; an animal in pain screams and writhes just as a human does. Ingrid Newkirk, the founder of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), describes this essential similarity: "When it comes to having a nervous system and the ability to feel pain, hunger, and thirst a rat is a pig is a dog is a boy" (Nancy Day 2000, pg. 100). One of the major problems with animal experiments is that the results frequently do not apply to humans. Irwin Bross, Ph. D., former director of biostatistics at the Roswell Institute for Cancer Research testified before congress in 1981 that "while conflicting animal results have often delayed and hampered advances in the war on cancer, they have never produced a single substantial advance either in the prevention or treatment of human cancer" (Nancy Day 2000, pg. 113). Animal tests that attempt to predict which substances cause human cancer have also been shown to be unreliable. If studies have shown that the experimentation on animals has shown to be unreliable why do scientists keep wasting their time killing innocent animals. Instead they should try to find the difference source that could help find a solution to cancer. When I was researching, I found that neurological diseases are another major cause of death and disabilities in the

<https://assignbuster.com/animal-testing-is-cruelty-and-it-is-abusive/>

United States. Again, animal experimentation in this area has not correlated well with human diseases. In 1990 an editorial in the Journal Stroke noted that 25 compounds that have being proven effective for treating stroke in animal models over the last 10 year have not proven to be effective for the use in human's strokes. Stephen Kaufman, M. D., reviewed animals model of such degenerative neurological disease as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's and conclude that " animal models designed to improve our understanding and treatment of these condition have had little impact and their future value is highly dubious"(Vaughan Monamy 2009, pg. 112). Two other areas where animal experimentation has been both consumptive of health care dollars and unproductive are psychology and addiction. Using animals to test therapeutic drugs has also proven unreliable. Penicillin kills guinea pigs and hamsters, but it is very beneficial for humans. Thalidomide, a tranquilizer formerly prescribed for pregnant women with morning sickness, caused serious birth defects in more than 10, 000 children, but does not cause birth defects in numerous species of nonhuman animals. The significance of pain should not be judged by the value of the sufferer—a friend, an annoying classmate, or an animal. If morality requires us to refrain from inflicting pain upon other people, then it should require us to refrain from inflicting pain upon animal as well, and, according to Richard Ryder, consultant with the Political Animal Lobby. We can treat different species differently, but always we should treat equal suffering equally. In the case of nonhumans, we see them mercilessly exploited in factory farms, in labratories, and in the wild. These are major abuses causing great suffering, yet they are still justified on the ground that these creatures are not of the same species as ourselves. The main difference between animals and humans is the ability to make

<https://assignbuster.com/animal-testing-is-cruelty-and-it-is-abusive/>

ethical judgments. Animals cannot distinguish between right and wrong; humans can. Some opponents of animal rights maintain that since animals do not have the ability to make moral decisions, they do not deserve moral consideration. Actually, the reverse of this argument is true: “ The human capacity to act morally obligates us to prevent animal suffering. It does not give us license to cause it” (Vaughan Monamy 2009, pg. 88).