

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.

Gareth Edwards, Chief Executive, National Animal Sanctuary Alliance

Q1 - My view is that there is no moral imperative or right for human beings to use animals in research.

Q2 - My view is that genetic modification of animals should not be done anyway and my answer to Q1 confirms I would not welcome their use in research.

Q3 - I believe there are sufficient alternatives for science not to have any need to abuse animals like this. Even if there were not alternatives, I do not believe we have the moral right to treat other animals in this way to prolong our lives.

Q4 - I think ethically human beings have no right to abuse other creatures and that in doing so, we damage ourselves morally and treat other creatures as Hitler treated Jews.

Q5 - Regulations are pathetically inadequate and we have a government that supports animal torture at any cost and props up an antiquated set of values and practices here without adequate funding for alternatives. Animal research is the equivalent of the Nuclear Power Industry - costly, dangerous and morally unacceptable, and if alternatives received the same level of funding we would achieve our end results much more effectively.

Q6 - I think if the researchers truly showed what they did more people like myself would only support charities who did not test on animals and would lobby for the royal commission this government promised but did not deliver on.