

C
by C C

Submission date: 11-Nov-2020 12:12PM (UTC-0800)

Submission ID: 1443195270

File name: animal,,w.edited.docx (20.49K)

Word count: 989

Character count: 5095

Students Name

Professor's Name

Course

Date

Thesis statement: Animal testing should not be considered since it is affecting animals, it can be costly and anything can go wrong regarding the animal.

Every medical advance is because of experimenting on animals

Counterarguments

The experiments are on the success due to the animals used in testing and performing the experiments. It enables scientists not to get human beings exposed to harmful chemicals and toxic substances that expose them to health risks. Some cosmetics are tested on animals so that any of the effects that will emerge will only affect animals to enhance the health of human beings. Therefore, before the products exposed to the population, they are tested on animals; consequently, it makes it easy to enhance medical discovery.

Animals are similar to human beings in terms of their anatomy and physiology; they test on the animal is appropriate so that any of the risks on the human being will get identified easily. It will not be painful when animals get tested on the vaccine. Many of the animals get to die, but if the experiments get done on human beings. The results become mass deaths; it will elicit a lot of pain in families. Animals are better at the sacrificial of the injuries that would get posed upon the human populations and have an inherited effect on many generations.

Rebuttal of counterargument.

Animals, yes, they have similarities with human beings. Still, there are several differences between the two, and the reactions that will get elicited in animals will be different from the responses that will get done on human beings. Such a situation will not have solved the risks (Akhtar and Aysha, 407-419). Still, the bet will get perceived in human beings since all the challenges will not get eliminated when dealing with experiments such as those involving human vaccines.

Who would we test if we do not have animals?

Counterarguments

The animals are the only way to test by the use of scientists, and there is nothing else other than the animals; therefore, animals are the best to use in the experimentations. The cost of using animals is small in research when given comparisons of the effects that will be upon the human population. Some of the impacts of these experiments will have a physical challenge, and they have hereditary challenges. Treating these side effects is much expensive when comparing healing the side effects that will emerge from these experiments, such as vaccine tests. There is nothing else that can get used in experiments like plants. The main aim of using animals is to reduce the risks imposed upon the human beings' population because there are no other alternatives. Therefore, animals have to get used to those scientific experiments.

Rebuttal to counterarguments

When testing for these products, such as cosmetics and vaccines, they can get tested on human beings because of the aim of the work used in human beings. When they get used to human beings, these products will be appropriate because they will elicit an accurate picture of the products' effects and other limitations (Roberts, Aled EL, et al., 223-229). Therefore, instead of using animals, it will be appropriate to have human beings as genie pigs, which will have more

positive results and the costs that get used upon buying animals. These will reduce the value of the scientists that will affect salaries.

Experiments are not painful towards animals

Counterarguments

Animals are feeding diverse foods, and they will adapt to many of the environmental factors and their body physicality in terms of the level of productions. They have allotted adaptive characteristics even when they are affected by the tests and experiments used. They can cope with the challenges they get to face. Some of the animals that get used in the experiments have short life cycles. Therefore, it is easy for the animals to be used for experimentations since the defects will not get eliminated in a few generations than human beings who have large life expectancies. Rabbits and mice used in the experiments can have many of the experiments when they get required in large numbers. They can multiply instead of having them bought, and they can get reused in other experiments. Will enable the risks to get eliminated in human beings. Many of the experimentations that get used on animals they result in many painful situations. Such cases will be very unbearable when done to human beings, making many human populations resist instances of being used as experimental animals. Therefore, due to the animal's innocence on experiment animals, it becomes perfect for applying animals in research. Animals can get it painful in the experimentation. Still, the ability and body conformation and pain endurance make it suitable and straightforward when dealing with investigations and tests done on animals. Humans are quite weeks in taking such experiments. Look at the skin of animals due to its thickness, and numerous furs enables them to apply the cosmetics on experiments in case of the burning pain which will emerge they can bear.

Rebuttal to counterargument

Animals, when they are used in this experimentation because many of the experiments bring about body reactions since that, are foreign to the body; therefore, they will need some pain killers, and that situation will be torturing the animals if the painkillers not applied to these animals

(Doke et al., 223-229). It will be against humanity and compassion when the animals get exposed to the process, and there is nothing provided to them so that the pain they get exposed to is alleviated.

Work cited

Akhtar, Aysha. "The flaws and human harms of animal experimentation." *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics* 24.4 (2015): 407-419.

Doke, Sonali K., and Shashikant C. Dhawale. "Alternatives to animal testing: A review." *Saudi Pharmaceutical Journal* 23.3 (2015): 223-229.

Roberts, Aled EL, et al. "The limitations of in vitro experimentation in understanding biofilms and chronic infection." *Journal of Molecular Biology* 427.23 (2015): 3646-3661.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

1 %

SIMILARITY INDEX

1 %

INTERNET SOURCES

0 %

PUBLICATIONS

0 %

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

www.austintxgensoc.org

Internet Source

1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off