

The response reproduced below was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on the ethics of research involving animals during October-December 2003. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

This response was submitted using the online facility:

Anonymous #22

QUESTIONS ANSWERED:

1. Background: the use of animals in research

ANSWER:

There is no excuse in a civilised society for causing intentional suffering to others. The life of a non-human animal is as important as that of a human animal. Over 95% of research done is a waste of time and money and suffering (e.g. cosmetics test, 'me-too' drugs). The other 5% could be done with non-animal research. Contact the Dr Hadwen Trust! The alternatives are there, they just need the funding! Research based on non-human animals is misleading, dangerous, and distracts attention from decent, non-animal research. Finally, many things can be prevented. Change the lifestyles of the people in the UK and most diseases would be cured!

2. Genetically modified animals

ANSWER:

There is no excuse in a civilised society for causing intentional suffering to others. The life of a non-human animal is as important as that of a human animal, whether genetically-modified or not. My comments to the previous question apply here too.

3. Alternatives

ANSWER:

The only research that should be allowed is research that does not involve vivisection. Volunteer studies etc. are fine. This should be a global policy. Funding should come from the same sources as funding comes from now. There is no shortage of money for research, but it is being channelled into all the wrong things!

4. Ethical issues

ANSWER:

There is no excuse in a civilised society for causing intentional suffering to others. The life of a non-human animal is as important as that of a human animal. See my answers to previous questions. The only pertinent question is 'do they suffer'. Anyone who has ever had a pet knows the answer to that. People who deny animal suffering are extremely dangerous, because all their arguments could also be used to deny that other humans suffer, and in that route lies solipsism, cruelty, and destruction. If a thing suffers (as all animals can) then causing their suffering is absolutely wrong.

5. The regulations

ANSWER:

There should be no research that causes suffering to animals. Welfare isn't the issue - RIGHTS are. 'Welfare' already assumes that it is alright to exploit other beings, which is completely wrong. All animals have a right not to be made to suffer.

6: Providing information to the public

ANSWER:

Any research done which causes suffering or death to animals is inherently untrustworthy, and the people funding or doing it must be mentally unhinged in order to be able to voluntarily cause suffering to other beings. Those people should be locked up, since they are obviously lacking in compassion. This fact is why the people doing the research hide the details of what they did with long, neutral-sounding and scientific terminology. They never admit to how many hundreds of thousands of animals they have tortured in their dirty industry.