

### What Each Student Must Submit

By 11:59 pm on March 25<sup>th</sup>, you (each student) must submit 300 words on what you want to contribute to the debate. Some possible questions you can respond to as your contribution: What are the competing interests or obligations in this issue? How should the moral interests be weighed or understood? Based on your position, what is the most challenging aspect of resolving these ethical problems? What is a problem with one of the opposing views? Do not attempt to answer all of these questions in your paper. Focus on one particular aspect of the case that you will present with your team. **Your contribution should be from the viewpoint of your assigned position.** In other words, if you are a scientist, then your 300 words should be a reflection on the debate from the perspective of someone who has the interests of a scientist. Depth and thoughtfulness are more important than breadth. **You should incorporate at least one of the readings assigned for the debate** (though you need to read *all* of the materials).

**On your paper, include your name and your team assignment** (e.g.: Jack Schmack, Scientist). Submit to Blackboard SafeAssign.

### What Each Group Needs to Do

On March 21<sup>st</sup>, you have the entire class period to strategize with your teammates. You should put together a coherent and compelling argument that reflects your interests in the issues at hand and responds to the debate questions (see below). If some members of the team want to “go rogue” and disagree with the majority opinion, that is fine. However, everyone must provide arguments from their assigned standpoint. For example, a scientist could disagree with the other scientists on how certain questions should be answered, but the scientist cannot start defending an animal liberationist view unless he/she can defend animal liberationism from the standpoint of a professional scientist. Keep in mind that when a team has numerous rogues, it will be increasingly difficult to present a coherent argument together. So do your best to accommodate the various concerns that people have to form a unified argument that you can present together. Without a minimally coherent argument, you cannot hope to hold much sway in this debate.

You have some flexibility in how you flesh out your position. There are several philosophical approaches and commitments that pro-research scientists, members of a governmental body, and animal advocates could have regarding the ethics of animal experimentation.

### Format

The debate will open with each team providing an overview of their argument for 3–5 minutes.

The moderator (Laura GG) will then ask each of the below questions. After each question, the teams will take turns providing a response. After a team responds to the question, the other two teams should provide a rebuttal to the team's answer.

The debate will close with the teams trying to find at least minimal agreement on what governmental regulations and professional guidelines should be put in place.

### Questions

1. Are rodents' preferences for social bonding, enriched environments, liberty of movement, and solid flooring morally relevant? If so, why? How should these interests be weighed against competing interests? If they are not relevant, why not?
2. Given the potential for neuroanatomical effects of spacious vs. cramped cages (among other things) in rodents, are researchers under a professional obligation to invest more time and money into studying the optimal living conditions for all lab animals and justifying their cage choices as part of their protocol (IACUC) review?
3. Should the Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International or the National Institutes of Health issue *requirements* (rather than just recommendations) for the care and use of rodents in biomedical experiments? If so, what should be required?

4. Requiring that researchers use more enriched environments could result in financial strain; money that could go toward more studies or lab equipment would instead be funneled toward cages. Does this use of resources make sense from a moral point of view? Are there any circumstances where these additional funds should *not* go toward better living conditions for lab animals?
5. Since the authors of the Institute of Medicine report on chimp research were split on whether chimps are necessary for HCV vaccine research, what should the IOM ultimately recommend? Should we err on the side of caution and protect the chimps? Or should the federal government continue to fund this type of research?
6. Are the new NIH criteria for federally funded chimp research (see table on pg. 424 of Wadman article) morally justified?
7. Should the government strive toward banning the use of chimps from all types of biomedical research (at least when chimps cannot be benefited by it)? Currently the new NIH guidelines only apply to chimps that are owned or supported by the government (612 of a total of 937 chimps that are currently available). If there were an eventual ban on using chimps, should this ban apply to privately funded research as well (so all 937+)?

## Groups

### **Pro-Research Scientists**

Beeck, Camila
Benevides, Phillip
Benjamin, Shayna
Colburn, Leiter
Crutchfield, Bryan
Dehner, Matthew
Dutkiewicz, Caitlin
Eisenach, Jane
Galvin, Erin
Goldberg, Rebecca

### **Governmental Agency/Department**

Paras, Matthew
Redfield, Jordan
Ryder, Brittany
Schaffer, Henry
Schoen, Bryan
Soelling, Stefanie
Vandegriff, Joe
Williams, Jennifer
Ye, Kening

### **Animal Advocates**

Hernandez, Carmen
Heyward, Philip
Iannolo, Lauren
Jenks, Whitney
Kasher, Alyssa
Letourneau, Nicholas
Mardis, Amy
McDevitt, Caroline
O'Connor, Colin
Pahlavi, Noor