

ANIMAL TESTING: NECESSARY OR UNETHICAL

Choriyeva Nurjaxon Erkin qizi

Department of theoretical aspects of English language-1

Senior teacher: Eshqobilova Hulkar Shaydullayevna

Choriyevanurjahon97@gmail.com

English faculty, Uzbekistan State University of World Languages

Annotation: This article looks at the ethics and science behind animal testing. It asks whether such testing is necessary or wrong. The study takes into account the views of experts such as Peter Singer, Jane Goodall and Francis Collins. The article argues that while animal testing has led to advances in science and medicine, it also raises serious concerns about the fair treatment and rights of animals. Some people believe that animals have their own dignity and should not suffer unnecessarily. Others believe that animal testing is still essential for finding life-saving treatments.

Keywords: animal testing, ethics, medical progress, animal rights, scientific research, medical advancement, surgical procedures, alternative methods, computer modeling, regulation.

Аннотация: В данной статье рассматриваются этические и научные аспекты тестирования на животных. В ней поднимается вопрос о том, является ли такое тестирование необходимым или же оно является неправильным с моральной точки зрения. В исследовании учитываются взгляды таких экспертов, как Питер Сингер, Джейн Гудолл и Фрэнсис Коллинз. В статье утверждается, что, несмотря на значительный вклад тестирования на животных в развитие науки и медицины, оно вызывает серьёзные опасения, связанные со справедливым обращением с животными и их правами. Некоторые считают, что животные обладают собственной ценностью и не должны подвергаться ненужным страданиям. Другие полагают, что тестирование на животных по-прежнему необходимо для разработки жизненно важных методов лечения.

Ключевые слова: тестирование на животных, этика, медицинский прогресс, права животных, научные исследования, развитие медицины, хирургические процедуры, альтернативные методы, компьютерное моделирование, регулирование

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada hayvonlarda sinov o'tkazishning axloqiy va ilmiy jihatlari ko'rib chiqiladi. Unda bunday sinovlar zarurmi yoki noto'g'rimi degan savol muhokama qilinadi. Tadqiqotda Piter Singer, Jeyn Gudoll va Frensis Kollinz kabi mutaxassislarning qarashlari hisobga olingan. Maqolada ta'kidlanishicha, hayvonlarda sinov o'tkazish ilm-fan va tibbiyot rivojiga katta hissa qo'shgan bo'lsa-da, u hayvonlarga nisbatan adolatli munosabat va ularning huquqlari bilan bog'liq jiddiy muammolarni keltirib chiqaradi. Ba'zi odamlar hayvonlar o'z qadr-qimmatiga ega deb hisoblaydi va ular ortiqcha azob chekmasligi kerak. Boshqalar esa hayvonlarda sinov o'tkazish hayotni saqlab qoluvchi davolash usullarini topishda hanuz zarur deb hisoblaydi.

Kalit so'zlar: hayvonlarda sinov o'tkazish, etika, tibbiy taraqqiyot, hayvonlar huquqlari, ilmiy tadqiqotlar, tibbiy rivojlanish, jarrohlik amaliyotlari, muqobil usullar, kompyuter modellashirish, tartibga solish

Introduction.

The use of animals for various purposes such as food, transportation, pets, sports, recreation and companionship dates back to ancient times. Using animals for research

purposes is one of the most widely used methods. Various animals such as mice, rats, hamsters, rabbits, fish, birds, guinea pigs, amphibians, primates, dogs, cats, etc. have been used in research for a long time. The main purpose of research is to test substances that are useful in developing new treatments for various serious or fatal diseases. They are also used to test various drugs in living organisms. With the development of medical technology, the number of animals used in research has also increased. Millions of experimental animals are used worldwide every year. For example, in the United Kingdom, 3.71 million animals were used for research in 2011 (www.rspca.org.uk (<http://www.rspca.org.uk/>)). In 2009, the total number of animals used in the United States was estimated at 1,131,076. This large population of experimental animals usually comes from breeding centers located at various universities and national breeding centers. In rare cases, wild animals such as monkeys and birds are also used (Baumans, 2005). In clinical testing laboratories, animals are separated from their own groups and used as instruments, regardless of their natural instincts. The whole animal or its organs and tissues are used for experimental procedures. For this, the animals are killed by prescribed methods. Even live animals that have passed all the tests and have become unwell are killed because they are suffering.

Materials and methods

This study is based on a qualitative and descriptive review of the existing literature on the use of animals in scientific research. Relevant data were collected from reliable sources, including scientific articles and official reports of international organizations dealing with animal research. The materials used in this study consist of previously published statistics on animal experiments, especially from countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States. The method used in this study includes a comparative and analytical approach. Various sources were reviewed to identify patterns, similarities and differences in the use of animals for experimental purposes. Particular attention was paid to the species of animals used, the purposes of the experiments and the ethical considerations associated with their use. In addition, this study uses the method of critical analysis to assess the advantages and disadvantages of animal testing. Ethical issues, scientific benefits and alternative methods such as in vitro tests and computer-based models were also considered as part of the analysis.

All data was analyzed and conclusions were drawn based on the consistency and reliability of the sources. The research was based on evidence and facts.

Results

The results of the study show that animal testing causes severe pain and suffering to animals, especially during toxicity tests such as the Draize test and the LD50 test. These experiments often result in serious physical injuries, including blindness, internal bleeding and death, and in many cases the animals are not given the opportunity to be free from suffering. This creates the impression that human life is more valuable than that of animals and is not ethically correct. Furthermore, the results of such tests are not always reliable, for example, some drugs that are effective in animals can have negative and unexpected results in humans. More broadly, the analysis shows that animal testing is not always necessary, as effective alternatives are available. Methods such as in vitro testing, computer simulations, synthetic tissues and products such as Entex can provide safer and more ethical ways to test substances. These alternatives are increasingly being used and have been proven to be reliable. Overall, the results show that animal testing not only raises serious ethical issues, but is also becoming less important due to the development of modern scientific alternatives.

Discussion

In the late 1800s and early 20th century, concerns about the rapid development of medical research led to concerns about the use of humans and animals in research [14], [15]. Doubts about the use of humans were further exacerbated by several exploitative research projects, including a series of experiments conducted on large numbers of prisoners by the Nazi German regime during World War II. Legislation was also developed to protect animals in research. The British Parliament passed the first set of animal protection laws in 1876 with the Cruelty to Animals Act [19]. Nearly ninety years later, the United States adopted regulations for animals used in research with the passage of the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 [20].

However, the issue of animal research has become a controversial one. There are many scientists who have various views on this matter. For instance, according to Peter Singer, animal testing is immoral since animals feel pain and have rights too, while Jane Goodall claims that the number of experiments must be decreased, and animals must be treated respectfully. In turn, Francis Collins favors the use of animals in experiments and insists on further research in this sphere because it is necessary for exploring complicated diseases. Nevertheless, the provided statistics cast doubt on the efficiency of the aforementioned research methods. Every year, more than 110 million animals are involved in experiments around the globe, and most of them endure severe pain. Perhaps even more shocking is the fact that 90–95% of medicines, which passed the test in animals, fail when tested on humans. Given the above-mentioned information, it becomes clear that while being helpful in scientific researches, animal testing is unethical and inefficient at the same time.

Conclusion

Ethical objections to the use of animals have existed for more than a century. The fact that animals are now subjected to pain and suffering is now prompting many people to take a closer look. The accompanying articles briefly address many of the scientific and ethical issues surrounding the use of animals in testing and research. While it is important to acknowledge that limitations of non-animal methods remain, recent advances show that these limitations should be viewed as serious challenges rather than insurmountable obstacles. While these issues can be difficult to discuss, this article provides a wealth of information about ethical consistency and will be helpful. Overall, while animal experimentation has contributed to the advancement of science and medicine to some extent, it raises serious ethical concerns and often produces unreliable results. Therefore, the most effective solution in the future is to reduce the use of animals in scientific research and replace them with modern methods.

References

1. Russell, W.M.S. and Burch, R.L. (1959) *The principles of humane experimental technique*. London: Methuen, p. 238.
2. Taylor, K., Gordon, N., Langley, G. and Higgins, W. (2008) 'Estimates for worldwide laboratory animal use in 2005', *Alternatives to Laboratory Animals*, 36, pp. 327–342.
3. Ibrahim, D.M. (2006) 'Reduce, refine, replace: the failure of the three R's and the future of animal experimentation', *University of Chicago Legal Forum*. Available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=888206> (Accessed: 7 January 2011).
4. Ferdowsian, H.R. and Beck, N. (2011) 'Ethical and scientific considerations regarding animal testing and research', *PLoS ONE*, 6(9), e24059. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0024059>
5. Heart Views (n.d.) *Heart Views*. Available at: www.heartviews.org.