

Animals as Experimental Subjects: Taylor, DeGrazia, Brody, Starr

Some important issues not really discussed in our reading: **research outsourcing**, **humane endpoint**, **class B dealers**

- On the confusing question of ‘**not tested on animals**’ claims...
- “If I believe that using animals in biomedical research and teaching is *inappropriate*, is it appropriate to accept and use the advances gained from animal use?”

Angus Taylor, ch. 5, “Is it Wrong to Use Animals for Scientific Research?” (119-145)

- “What gives the issue of animal experimentation its distinct edge is, first, that the infliction of pain and injury is frequently a *desired* aspect of the activity and, second, that such treatment of animals is said to be a *necessary* condition for the relief of human suffering.” (120)
- Categories of animal use: biomedical research, **toxicity testing**, behavioral research, use in education (dissection, surgery practice, high-school science)...others?
- The **Three Rs (3Rs)**: replacement, reduction, refinement (and the role of **alternatives**)
- Harry **Harlow’s ‘maternal deprivation’** experiments (130-131)
- “To show that we would be worse off if we stopped animal experimentation is not to resolve the moral issue.”
- LaFollette and Shanks *Brute Science*: three “moral asymmetries”: **acts versus omissions** (“it is worse to do evil than to fail to prevent evil”), definite harms versus possible benefits, and the creatures who suffer versus the creatures who benefit.
- Marxist and feminist critiques of ‘objective and masculinist science’ (136)
- “The announcement of the arrival of Dolly immediately fuelled speculation about the possibility of cloning human beings. Ian Wilmut, leader of the research team, dismissed the idea as unethical...” (137) But if Dolly died prematurely and riddled with arthritis, what, to be a bit sarcastic, is even vaguely ethical about that?

David DeGrazia, “The Ethics of Animal Research: What are the Prospects for Agreement?”

- Do you accept DeGrazia’s characterization of the two ends of this spectrum (the biomedicine ‘party line’ and the ‘especially zealous animal advocates’)
- Four points of disagreement: the moral status of animals in comparison with humans, the specific circumstances in which the worthy goal of promoting human health justifies harming animals, the issue of whether current protections for research animals are more or less adequate, and whether animal life is morally protectable.

Baruch A. Brody, “Defending Animal Research: An International Perspective”

- “a reasonably pro-research position on animal research”; 1) animals have interests which can be adversely affected by research, 2) the adverse effect on animals’ interests is morally relevant, 3) the justification for conducting a research program on animals is the benefits that human beings would receive, 4) in deciding whether the research question should be justified, human interest should be given greater significance than animal interests
- Let’s map out the **continuum of positions** from what Brody calls **lexical priority** to that of **discounting**
- “What discounting affirms, and what [Singer and other preference utilitarians] deny, is that even when there is no quantitative difference in the amount of suffering, the human suffering counts more morally.” (322)
- Distinguishing special obligations from personal prerogatives or **supererogatory** goods (323)

Lynda Birke, “Who—or What—are the Rats (and Mice) in the Laboratory”

- “To become our saviors in the struggle against ill health, rats and mice...must become something other than the rodent-as-animal: These, after all, are animals we generally loathe...Public acceptance is greater just because they are animals we abhor (and this in turn is heeded by antivivisectionist organizations, which rarely use rats or mice in their illustrations).” (238-9) ... “the lab rodent has been doubly othered” (331)

F. Barbara Orlans, “Ethical Themes of National Regulations Governing Animal Experiments: An International Perspective” [increasing scale from 1-8 in terms of how much countries regulate lab animal welfare, on p. 334]