

Is Animal Testing Justified?

Posted on September 18, 2018

Animal testing should be banned for a variety of reasons. One of the main reasons is cruelty, and the other reason is that there exists no real advantage to animal testing since they are not equal to human beings. The other reason is that there exists another method that is widely available which does not entail the cruel treatment of animals.

When picking perfumes and cosmetics, people rarely bother to check the type of makeup they use. The choices made by people in choosing cosmetics could be enhancing animal brutality and cruelty without their awareness. Among the most disturbing and cruel experiments ever carried out is animal testing. Most of the cosmetics on sale in the market, such as mascara, are tested on animals. A variety of operations over the world are done using helpless and defenseless animals. Most individuals, however, rarely look at the kind of cosmetics they are using. The type of experiments done on animals in the laboratories is so inhumane that no person would stop to imagine one individual doing it to another (Miller). This has triggered more support for banning animal tests. Among the reasons cited include arguments that the tests are cruel, brutal, and unnecessary and deliver inaccurate and unreliable results.

Animal testing should not be carried out, and furthermore, it should be banned. This is because these tests amount to nothing since the results obtained are inaccurate. Most medics and scientists have further contended that doing research using animals is down medical research. This is because animals and humans are incomparable. They argue that the data acquired through such experiments is misleading. While the examinations and tests could tell more about how animals experience various infections, they hardly show or provide anything essential and of value that applies to human beings. There is no essence in using animals in medical tests since they are not even useful (Miller). Consequently, it has been realized that animal tests do not offer accurate results or predictions on the extent to which human beings can be affected by a particular drug. This means that carrying out drug tests using animals does not protect people from harmful and dangerous medications. The continuous use of this procedure is complicated, particularly the fact that there is no gain from it, and it harms the defenseless animals used ("Surgical Training Using Live Animals: Can It Be Justified?" 15-15).

Animal tests and experiments are unethical processes. In an instance, sixty-four beagles were forced to inhale radioactive Strontium 90 by the Lovelace Foundation, Albuquerque, New Mexico. This was a part of the more extensive Fission Product Inhalation Program, which started in 1961. The program was funded by the US Atomic Energy Commission. This test resulted in the death of twenty-five of the dogs used. One of these deaths occurred from a brain hemorrhage, while another one was during an epileptic seizure. Other dogs that passed on exhibited signs of fever and anemia lost their appetite and suffered hemorrhages before dying (Taylor).

Animal experimenting is testing on animals, and it encompasses operations as well as surgeries. Take

this fact into consideration; most people have debated in support of the banning of animal tests. Morality is a key argument. Experiments, operations, and surgeries deprive the animals of their peace and thus demoralize them. Animal tests are unethical since they violate the rights of animals and, therefore, are subject to restrictions and forbidding. It also affects the food chain negatively by disrupting its cycle. Notably, the opponents of animal tests argue that the process has harmful effects on the environment (DeGrazia, 692).

The fact that the process is against and violates the rights of animals is a significant point in deeming animal testing unnecessary, inefficient, and ineffective. Before such experiments are conducted, scientists need to consider animal rights as well as the ethical and moral standards that govern the existence of both human beings and animals. There is a risk that the animals could suffer permanent harm or even die. Animals also fear and are a subject of pain just like people do. Therefore, experimenting with them should be banned, and animals should be allowed to thrive freely unless they are under a person's care. It is ethically and morally wrong to lock up pets in a cage or a laboratory and carry out all sorts of experiments. Such tests subject the animals to torture, abuse, and also suffer pain. Claims that animal experiments may save millions of lives are questionable (Taylor). While they argue that animal testing is the most efficient and accurate means of researching human diseases and medicines, it is clear that both animals and human beings have different anatomical structures and, thus, different functionalities.

Testing on animals, as well as the use of cognitive drugs on animals, is cruel and results in stress for the animals (Taylor). They are locked in cages where they are poked and prodded for long hours. While animals cannot be compared to human beings in terms of intelligence, it is proven that they are also intelligent by their standards. Most animals can be trained to display a character that indicates feelings of emotions, pain, stress, or fear (Miller). It is obvious and expected that animals are likely to get stressed when kept in cages all day alone and forced to face painful tests. On the contrary, animals should be left to roam freely and experience the healthy life they were born to enjoy. While they can neither speak nor express their feelings in words, they possess some intelligence, and hence, their rights ought to be safeguarded by getting rid of unnecessary and inappropriate animal testing.

Other than cruelty in animal tests, there is no real significance in executing tests on animals and administering cognitive drugs. Since animal anatomy can be likened to human anatomy, it is not homologous to human anatomy. This, therefore, means that no real findings can be obtained for human study through animal testing ("Surgical Training Using Live Animals: Can It Be Justified?" 15-15). The human anatomy is complicated in comparison to that of animals used in tests, such as mice and rats. While people have similar body systems as mammalian animals, they do not share similar effects or reactions to medical tests (DeGrazia, 691). In an actual sense, the thought that human beings would portray the same results as those of animals can be dangerous.

Advancements in science and technology have played a crucial role since they have led to more efficient methods, which have resulted in the outdated of animal tests and deeming them

unnecessary. Currently, the United States Department of Transportation applies Corrositex. This is an experiment in which a chemical is introduced to a protein membrane rather than smearing it on the backs of rabbits, thus eating through their skin. The previous expenses amounted to around US\$100 for every test and yielded results in a matter of a couple of hours. The latter costs range between US\$400 to US\$1200 for every analysis done. Through such tests, scientists are now able to develop artificial human skin used in skin-irritation and skin graft tests. Through the use of artificial human skin, the National Cancer Registry, as well as other infection-reporting mechanisms, depict the exact experiences people have under all types of conditions. They also tell more about human illnesses in comparison to the results obtained through animal tests ("Surgical Training Using Live Animals: Can It Be Justified?" 15-15).

Conclusively, it is a cruel act of testing on animals as it leads to fear, pain, and stress. The tests are also administered without the consent of animals. Such tests are significantly inconclusive since humans have different anatomy from animals, and therefore, the results obtained cannot reflect what would be expected of a human body. Lastly, there are other techniques available that provide more reliable and accurate results. Based on these arguments, it is conclusive that animal testing ought to be eliminated as it is ineffective and inhumane.

Work Cited

"Surgical Training Using Live Animals: Can It Be Justified?." *Lab Animal* 36.4 (2007): 15-15. Web.

DeGrazia, David. "The 37 Ethics of Animal Research." *The Animal Ethics Reader* (2016): 321.

Miller, Debra A. *The Rights Of Animals*. Detroit: Greenhaven Press, 2009. Print.

Taylor, Katy. "Experiences Of The REACH Testing Proposals System To Reduce Animal Testing." *ALTEX* (2014): n. pag. Web.