

16. You are to take part in a debate about animal-testing experiments. In pairs, prepare arguments for both the researchers and the campaigners against those experiments.

Arguments for:

Animal testing has contributed to many life-saving cures and treatments.

There is no adequate alternative to testing on a living, whole-body system.

Animals are appropriate research subjects because they are similar to human beings in many ways.

Animals must be used in cases when ethical considerations prevent the use of human subjects.

Animals themselves benefit from the results of animal testing (some cures are useful for animal species, too)

Animal research is highly regulated in most countries, with laws in place to protect animals from mistreatment.

Relatively few animals are used in research, which is a small price to pay for advancing medical progress.

The vast majority of biologists and several of the largest biomedical and health organizations in the United States endorse animal testing.

Arguments against:

Animal testing is cruel and inhumane.

Animals can suffer like humans do.

Alternative testing methods now exist that can replace the need for animals.

Animals are very different from human beings and therefore make poor test subjects.

Drugs that pass animal tests are not necessarily safe.

Animal tests do not reliably predict results in human beings.

Most experiments involving animals are flawed, wasting the lives of the animal subjects.

Medical breakthroughs involving animal research may still have been made without the use of animals.

The laws have not succeeded in preventing horrific cases of animal abuse in research laboratories.

More arguments for both sides together with details can be found in: <https://animal-testing.procon.org/>