

Biological Sciences First Year Seminar on Research Ethics

Research Involving Non-Human Animals

As you read the material for our next class, keep the questions below in mind. To answer these questions you will have to reflect critically on what you have read and possibly re-read important passages. Keep in mind that there are two basic kinds of information that you need to look for in the readings:

1. What are the main points or conclusions that an author accepts with respect to a particular issue?
2. What are the reasons, important considerations, and evidence that lead the author to accept that conclusion?

For our purposes, *it is information of the second sort that will be our primary concern* since our most basic task is to *evaluate the reasons and evidence* that are offered to support accepting one possible conclusion about an issue, rather than another.

Remember that your **Reading Response #3** is due by Wednesday, February 5th at 12:00PM (noon) via Turnitin. This write up should contain brief answers to these questions, totalling 500–600 words in length and conforming to the to the course's "General Technical Requirements for Formatting Assignments". Be sure to also print out a copy of your response for your own reference. This will help prepare you to speak intelligently about these issues during our next class meeting.

Readings

- Jerrold Tannenbaum and Andrew N. Rowan, "Rethinking the Morality of Animal Research".
- Harold A. Herzog, Jr., "The Moral Status of Mice".
- Lila Guterman, "New Attacks on Animal Researchers Provoke Anger and Worry".

Questions

1. According to Jerrold Tannenbaum and Andrew Rowan, what parameters should be evaluated and considered when determining the moral and proper use of animals in research? Which ethical argument(s) most accurately represents what you feel is the correct position towards the use and care of animals for research and why?
2. According to Harold Herzog, what is it that influences the moral and legal standing of these groups of mice and how that are perceived and treated? Do you agree with him that the moral judgments we make regarding other species is "neither logical nor consistent"? Why or why not?
3. Although the story of firebombing the home of a researcher is extreme, is there a place for animal rights activism in the arguments surrounding the use of animals in research? Overall, how involved should society at large be in judging the appropriateness of a given animal research project?