



Understanding Animal Research
Hodgkin Huxley House
30 Farringdon Lane
London EC1R 3AW

Telephone **020 3675 1230**
Facsimile **020 3411 7808**
Email info@uar.org.uk
www.understandinganimalresearch.org.uk

Dear For Life on Earth,

In response to your letter dated 27.05.2014, we are more than willing to participate in a debate on the pros and cons of animal research. As previously mentioned, we helped organise 30 debates last year at universities across the country to give students an opportunity to make up their own mind on this complex issue.

We are concerned that the nine debate themes (as outlined on your website) do not cover all animal research, for example research on one animal species for the benefit of a second species is not included. Furthermore, we question the assumption that all animal research into diseases intends to be “predictive” – we are aware that there are species differences, but that it not to say that useful knowledge cannot be gleaned.

Of the nine debates you suggest, it would be useful to first debate the basic research that underpins the applied research. To this end we feel it would be more valuable to leave the applied question of using animals as models for human disease to the end, and to first debate a theme such as the use of animals and animal tissues to study basic physiological principles.

We question your definition of *ad hominem*. An *ad hominem* exists when you ignore an argument in favour of attacking the individual saying it. Mr Mansfield does not provide an argument as to why your original debate “is well set out and fair”. Given that no reason is provided it is fair for us to question the objective capacity his claim was given in.

We would like to know the names of those you wish to put forward to debate in these nine debates, so that we can begin the process of finding scientists who might best put forward the case for animal research. I understand that the speakers will be from Europeans for Medical Advancement, an organisation which has [included individuals such as Jerry Vlasak](#). We must clearly state that we will not participate in any debate against anyone, such as Jerry Vlasak, who has [promoted the use of violence](#) against scientists.

It may also be useful to begin to compile potential moderators so that we can find those mutually agreeable to both of us.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Wendy Jarrett', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Wendy Jarrett