

Emily Reichard

Mr. Tovar

Senior English

12 September 2011

### Annotated Bibliography

“Animal Testing 101.” *PETA: People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals*. PETA. n.d.

Web. 30 Aug. 2011.

Although testing is an important aspect of scientific research, it is not appropriate to do testing on animals that is cruel and unusual. Companies like Clorox, producers of household cleaning products, test their products on animals by putting substances into their eyes, on their skin or putting the substance on their skin for long periods of time. These types of tests are not beneficial to humans what so ever. Even if the animals do react badly to the product that is being tested on them, the product still ends up going on the shelves for people to buy. Meaning that the people who buy that product are supporting the company to keep carrying out these horrific tests on innocent animals. The author’s stance is obviously against animal testing in showing that the institute wants the website’s viewers to sign up and pledge to be cruelty-free.

Barnard, Neal. “Animal Testing?” *Vegetarian Times*. Mar. 2007: 19-21. Print.

Even though animal testing is considered a “back in the day” experimentation, it is still happening today and maybe more abusive then ever. This article states the other processes that can be done besides animal testing. The truth is that the products and tests that are done on animals are not beneficial to humans, so scientists have grown human skin cells in test tubes in order to replace testing on animal skin. Scientists have also created a product that they call the physiological chip, which is a small chip that acts like the circulatory system and mimics the functions that it does in the human body. The chip is very useful when testing for useful and repercussions of experimental drugs that are intended to be available for humans. Human volunteering for certain experiment drugs is another alternative that can be taken in order to replace animal testing. The author’s stance is against animal testing because in the magazine article it states the possible testing that can be done in a test tube instead of on an animal.

Coghlan, Andy. “Grief and Stress Among Those Who Care For Lab Animals.” *EBSCO*

*Publishing Service Selection Page*. 29 March 2008. Web. 08 Sept. 2011.

This article discusses the hardships that laboratory animal technicians have to go through when performing experimentations on the lab animals. In the article it states that the technicians are expected to kill the animals they have worked with and looked after for several months or years once the experimentation on them is complete. Scientists have learned that once the euthanasia is brought into the picture, the lab techs receive sudden pangs of guilt about letting the animal die right before their eyes. In the article, it also states that people working in lab are looked at as the “bad people” when really they did not expect to kill the animals themselves. The killing of their lab animals make the lab techs feel great remorse and feel like they have no one to talk to for emotional support. The author does not really state what side of the controversy that he is on. Coghlan is trying to convey to the reader that the lab techs working in animal experimentations and testing do have respect. The emotions towards the animals they are working with are difficult to deal with because it is like the animals are the lab techs’ best friends.

Cohen, John. “Thinking Like a Chimpanzee.” *Smithsonian Magazine* 41.5 (2010): 50.

Print.

Most animal testing is perceived as negative. But there is a humane type of animal testing that could be beneficial to humans and bring the species one step closer to its ancestors. An American scientist traveled to Inuyama, Japan to study with a Japanese scientist who trained chimpanzees from birth. In his laboratory, Matsuzawa had a large enclosure of chimpanzees in which he took care of, studied and communicated with. Most of Matsuzawa’s research and studying that involves the chimps would be to test their knowledge of patterns and numbers on a device that is much similar to an iPad. Even though chimpanzees are a close relation to humans, Matsuzawa says that the chimps only had a very short vocabulary comprehension, meaning that the chimpanzees have a much smaller vocabulary than their human relatives. The author does not state which side of the controversial topic they are on.. But it seems like the author is in favor of animal testing, especially the tests that are not harming the animals but simply testing their abilities and how those abilities are similar to humans.

Festing, Simon. “Don’t Waste the Animals.” *EBSCO Publishing Service Seelction Page*.

5 June 2010. Web. 06 Sept. 2011.

In this article, the author talks about how animal experimentation has been negatively put into the media, which puts many people against the topic and makes it a very controversial subject. The author states that much scientific research that involves animals is not very well laid out. The experiments are designed poorly, meaning that it does not have an objective, and the experiments are also poorly reported to the public. The article goes on and states that animal experimentation is beneficial to humans and animals when certain important drugs are found in order to lengthen the life of the human population or different animal populations as well. It seems that the author of this article is for animal experimentation because the testing is beneficial when the research is done properly and is recorded. It seems like the author thinks that the government, animal

testing laboratories and companies do not keep a close eye on what is going on within the laboratory; it should be kept an eye on because animals should not be abused in the lab and the public likes to see what is going on in scientific advancements.

Goldberg, Alan M. "Protecting More Than Animals." *EBSCO Publishing Service*

*Selection Page*. Jan. 2006. Web. 06 Sept. 2011.

Even though the article is quite long, the author states many accurate points including the three R's that should be done in order to eliminate animal testing all together. The three R's that were mentioned in this article were: Reduction of animal testing, Refinement of animal testing, and Replacement of animal testing all together. The article also states what other countries are doing in order to prevent animal testing from happening. For example, since 2003 in Europe it was not acceptable for cosmetics to be sold in the store if the very last ingredients or the product was tested on animals. Goldberg, the author of the article, states that animal testing is appropriate when done at a veterinary clinic or hospital in order to determine what is wrong with the animal, but animal testing is not appropriate when it is done on animals for no apparent reason.

Kaufman, Steven. "Is Animal Experimentation Worthwhile?" *Nutrition Health*

*Review: The Consumer's Medical Journal*. 2003: 3-8. Print.

In an interview with Dr. Steven Kaufman he was asked multiple questions on what he thinks of animal testing and if it is beneficial to the human race or not. Throughout the interview, Dr. Kaufman was asked to give a brief background on how long animal experimentation has been around and how much larger the industry has gotten up to present day. As the interview goes on, Dr. Kaufman is asked what kind of animals are used in animal testing and where the laboratories get the animals from. In the interview, Dr. Kaufman was asked if it was difficult to find human volunteers for certain testing and he responded with "no," so he does not understand why animal testing just does not stop all together. All throughout the interview it is quite simple to tell that Dr. Kaufman is very much against animal testing and he also thinks that there can be other alternatives that would be more helpful to humans instead of doing horrific testing on innocent animals.

Monamy, Vaughan. *Animal Experimentation a Guide to the Issues*. Cambridge, UK:

Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.

In their book, the author discusses what it is like for them to be a zoologists and what the professors did not teach in school, which was how to treat lab animals with respect or the ethnics of being a zoologist. The author also goes on to discuss where animal testing and experimentation started out and how anesthetics were not discovered or developed until the middle of the nineteenth century. The author's book is very informative on the subject of animal testing and goes on to talk about more history and ethics of experimentation,

ethnic status of the animals in the lab and the people that are working with them, what type of experimentations go on around the world, including Europe, the United States and Australia and finally alternatives that can be taken to reduce the amount animal testing, experimentation and research. The author's stance is difficult to see, but when the author discusses the alternatives to animal research it seems that they are against the controversial topic of animal testing.

Watson, Stephanie. *Animal Testing: Issues and Ethics*. New York: Rosen Pub., 2009.

Print.

In this book, the author discusses what goes on in the laboratory during animal testing and also how the process came about. The author puts many decent facts in her book including: animals and humans have biological similarities and more than 25,000 animals are used in experimentation each year. Animals are not just used in the lab; they are also used in education in schools in biology and human anatomy classes. But the author also makes decent points on how animal testing is beneficial and not inhumane, for example, the author states that organ transplants and insulin may not have been found without testing on animals. The author seems to be on each side of the controversial topic, because she states that animal testing is sometimes inhumane but she also states that animals are very helpful in the medical in order to find new drugs that would be beneficial to humans, like insulin for example.

Wright, George, and Steve Hoagland. "Counterpoint: Animal Testing Is Cruel and

Immoral Regardless of the Benefits Associated With It." *EBSCO Publishing*

*Service Selection Page*. 2009. Web. 07 Sept. 2011.

In this article, the authors discuss if animals used for medical experiments are questionable and/or immoral practices. The authors understand that chimpanzees with close genome sequences to humans are tested for human products but it is not right when the chimpanzees or other animals that are being tested to be abused. In the article, Peter Singer a professor of bioethics at Princeton was interviewed and he stated that even though animals don't belong in the human species they still should be treated as if they were human beings. Many topics came up in this article about animal cruelty, science or cruelty, and why people are ignoring the animal experimentation problem. The authors make a good point in saying that if animals are not being abused in the laboratory, then why is the testing done in secret like it is an illegal process. The laboratory should be sharing the information that they are finding for the testing instead of keeping it in secret from the public who, after all, the animal testing is "benefiting." The authors are obviously against animal testing because they are stating different ways to change animal testing in order to make the testing more public and also hoping to propose to diminish the problem all together.

