

|
by B J

Submission date: 30-Aug-2021 01:27AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1637694930

File name: Moral_Disagreement.edited.edited.docx (16.13K)

Word count: 511

Character count: 2900

1
The Use of Animals in Scientific Experiments

Name:

Institution:

Course:

Instructor:

Date:

1 The Use of Animals in Scientific Experiments

Moral conflicts can occur for many causes. People can disagree regarding applicable ethical beliefs, including what the doctrines are, how they are formed, how they are ordered, and weighted. They may disagree on whether morality is motivated by doctrines. I recently had a moral disagreement with a close relative regarding using animals as test subjects. Before the breakthrough in creating essential medicines and vaccines, animals are used to test the efficacy of such inventions in the scientific world. That is the norm among scientists where rats and primates are used as the primary test subjects before humans are included in the trials. In my view, the use of animals is justified, but my friend (John) is of the contrary opinion.

In my view, the use of animals in scientific research is crucial since it enables researchers to comprehend human health and assist in the development of new vaccines and medicines. Withdrawing living creatures from the experiment would inhibit our knowledge of health and ailments, affecting the introduction of alternative and critical treatment options. Strict regulations are set to guarantee that the experiments involving animals are carried out responsibly. In addition to that, new medicines necessitate testing since scientists must assess both the good and bad effects of a substance on an entire organism. Animal experiments offer information on safety and efficacy. They define possible risks, but they also decide on the dosage administered to volunteer groups and sick people in the first human clinical trials.

My friend John argues that the use of animals in scientific experiments is painful, erratic, and hazardous. Animal experimentation is not only harsh, but it is also frequently counterproductive. Many human diseases, like significant types of heart disorder, many forms of tumors, HIV, Parkinson's disease, and schizophrenia, do not harm animals. Conversely, in research facilities, symptoms of these sicknesses are falsely induced to recreate the human

infection in animals used as subjects. These experiments, nevertheless, diminish the intricacies of human conditions, which are predisposed by a variety of elements like genetic makeup, socio-economic conditions, ingrained mental problems, and several life familiarities. According to John, It is unsurprising that therapeutic interventions that show 'potential' in animals seldom work in humans. Not only is time, finances, and the lives of wildlife being squandered (with a great deal of distress), but effective interventions are being thrown away by misjudgment while harmful therapeutic interventions are getting through. John believes that the assistance for animal experimentation is primarily based on an anecdotal story and is not supported by empirical evidence.

To sum it up, John is correct to some extent because, despite centuries of scientific experiments on cancer, vascular dementia, Parkinson's disease, Mellitus, pulmonary embolism, and AIDS in animals, we still lack reliable and fully effective treatments. Regardless, the use of animals in scientific experiments is justifiable because it is done under humane conditions and is crucial in helping us understand different diseases and test the effectiveness and efficacy of new drugs.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

3%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

3%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

Ehud I. Assia, Yigal Rotenstreich, Irina S. Barequet, David J. Apple, Mordechai Rosner, Michael Belkin. "Experimental studies on nonpenetrating filtration surgery using the CO2 laser", Graefe's Archive for Clinical and Experimental Ophthalmology, 2006

Publication

3%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off