

Isabelle Rua Parra

Instructor Bacon

PHIL 1020-004

26 November 2019

The Flaws of Animal Experimentation

Animal experimentation is justified by arguments that are reliable, that animals represent models of human science and maladies, and its utilization provides significant human medical advantages (Akhtar, Aysha). Many consumers do not know where their products come from and how they were developed, but as they look more into where they spend their money, animal testing will become less popular. Analyzing the validity of animal experimentation leads to worries about its reliability and predictive value for human results and for interpreting human physiology (Akhtar, Aysha). The inconsistency of animal experimentation over a variety of places undermines logical contentions for the training.

Annually, more than 115 million animals are used worldwide in experimentation or to supply the biomedical industry (Jarvenpaa). Most experiments on animals do not correspond to human biology and they are not significant to medical advances. Although, animals are similar to humans in the sense that they experience fear, suffering, and fear as humans do. Animal experiments only benefit human research if their outcomes result to be valid and can be applied to humans. Not all scientists are convinced that these tests are valid or even useful. There are many alternative solutions that can be used in place of animal testing such as: in vitro testing, computer modeling, human tissues, etc (Jarvenpaa). The main reason people believe that this research benefits humans is because of the media, researchers, colleges, and campaigning groups

(“Animal Testing Is Bad Science: Point/Counterpoint”). These groups mislead people into thinking they have found new cures and talk about how they have played in past restorative advances. The claims that have come from groups like the media and campaigning groups, and even people in universities that are not qualified, lead into the effect of an informal fallacy. In *Logic*, an appeal to an unqualified authority is defined as an argument that relies on the opinions of people who have no expertise, training, or knowledge relevant to the issue at hand. People who have no background in this topic should not be informing others. It is misleading and forms misconceptions.

A premise is a statement that an argument states will justify the conclusion. One of the premises for the flaws of animal experimentation is that animals feel pain just as humans do; in the laboratories they are the subjects of a painful or even deadly experiment. In the article, “Cruelty to Animals in Laboratories”, it states, “Animals are infected with diseases that they would never normally contract, tiny mice grow tumors as large as their own bodies, kittens are purposely blinded, rats are made to suffer seizures, and primates’ skulls are cut open and electrodes are implanted in them...After enduring these terrifying, painful procedures, animals are then usually dumped back into a cage without any painkillers” (“Cruelty to Animals in Laboratories”). This is unethical and cruel. This should not be allowed anywhere, and some countries such as New Zealand, India, Norway, etc have already started banning these experiments for certain kinds of consumer goods (“Animal Testing 101”). The ethics principle “do no harm” that is applied to humans, should be applied to animals as well. Testing on animals is justified because of what experiments are designed to solve. Research that causes harm to a life, human or animal, is not justifiable.

This leads into another premise that animals cannot vocalize their own choices; therefore, their decisions are made for them. When humans take animals into captivity, they sacrifice themselves for the advancement of human welfare. In the article it states, “The side effects that might impact a rabbit or a rat from a chemical added to a certain hand cream might not have any such effect on a human. And when that is the case, the animal was caged, tested against its will, potentially suffered greatly from the impact of the chemicals and the handling, and never was able to sense any kind of freedom or free choice – for absolutely no positive reason.” Being tested on, is not right when they cannot consent. Beneficence is a research principle for ethics which states that researchers should have the welfare of the research participant as a goal of any clinical trial or other research study. This applies to humans and it should apply to animals as well.

As defined in *Logic*, natural deduction is a proof procedure by which the conclusion of an argument is validly derived from the premises through the use of rules of inference. The premises of the argument, the flaws of animal experimentation, validly form the conclusion through the use of a proof. A proof is a sequence of steps of which includes an assumption, or follows from the preceding sentences in the sequence by a rule of inference. This leads into the use of truth tables, which are a form of analysis. Truth tables contain truth values that would occur under the premises of a given scenario. As a result, the table helps visualize whether an argument is logical in the scenario. Both of these logical tools use the premises of this argument to derive the conclusion that animal testing is wrong and should be terminated.

Chapter 1, page five to six of *Logic*, gives the example of the difference between an opinion and a formulated argument. It is important to have premises that formulate a valid

argument to support a conclusion; otherwise, the statement will just be an opinion. The class discussions in week thirteen have contributed to the answer of “What can I do with logic?” by explaining informal fallacies. Informal fallacies contain errors in reasoning, relevance, unwarranted assumption, and ambiguity or diversion. The informal fallacy appeal to an unqualified authority has contributed to this argument by showing how different, unqualified groups have misled people to think animal experimentation can be justified.

In conclusion, animal testing is cruel and should not be justified for any reason. If humans do not wish that testing on themselves, there is no reason to perform the experiments on another form of life. There are many alternatives to animal testing that researchers can use that are more effective, less costly, and faster. Many companies have already eliminated their use of animal experimentation, which shows that it is possible. The use of logic has shown that these valid premises have derived the conclusion that animal experimentation is flawed and should no longer be used as a form of research.

Works Cited

Akhtar, Aysha. "The flaws and human harms of animal experimentation." *Cambridge quarterly of healthcare ethics : CQ : the international journal of healthcare ethics committees* vol. 24,4 (2015): 407-19. doi:10.1017/S0963180115000079.

"Animal Testing Is Bad Science: Point/Counterpoint." *PETA*, 23 June 2010, <https://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-experimentation/animal-testing-bad-science/>.

"Animal Testing 101." *PETA*, 22 June 2010, <https://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-experimentation/animal-testing-101/>.

"Cruelty to Animals in Laboratories." *PETA*, 22 June 2010, <https://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-experimentation/animals-laboratories/>.

Jarvenpaa, Mikko. "Animal Testing: The Dark Truth About What Happens in the Labs." *Sentient Media*, 25 Nov. 2019, <https://sentientmedia.org/animal-testing/>.