



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](http://www.understandinganimalresearch.org.uk)

Dear For Life on Earth,

Thank you for your response. Allow us to clarify: we are concerned that your debate themes do not cover all research using animals. For example research on one non-human animal species for the benefit of a second non-human animal species (i.e. veterinary and wildlife conservation research) is not included within any of the nine uses of animals in research, as [laid out on your website](#).

We also note that you have misquoted us in your previous letter. We questioned the assumption that 'all animal research **into diseases** intends to be "predictive"' – an assumption that you appear to make, according to your list of nine ways animals are used in research (only point 1 deals with research into disease, and it uses the word "predictive").

It does not appear to make sense to discuss the question of the predictive value of animal models before we have discussed the role of animals in basic research. We feel the first debate should examine whether or not animal research remains important for the basic research which underpins applied research.

Nonetheless, we did accept a debate based on the tweet you sent. In that [video](#) Alex Irving says: "EDM263 was recently tabled by Paul Flynn MP. It calls for properly moderated public debate between scientists on both sides asking them to provide evidence that animal experiments benefit medical research". Thus we propose a mutually agreeable debate of: "[Do] animal experiments benefit medical research?"

Working research scientists are incredibly busy people, and we will be unable to confirm exactly who will be speaking until you are closer to determining the details of the debates.

The thirty debates organised last year as part of the Big Animal Research Debate aimed to discuss both the scientific and moral issues relating to animal research. Students are aware that both the ethical and scientific arguments had to be valid in order to reject a ban on animal research – and the student votes showed they believed both arguments to be valid. It should also be noted that student organisations were responsible for inviting speakers. Nonetheless, we are curious as to why you feel the arguments of a scientist who has conducted animal research, but now works towards ending it, are not appropriate?

I fear you may have misunderstood the meaning of *ad hominem*. An *ad hominem* attack only exists where someone attempts to discredit a person's argument by criticising the person (as opposed to the argument). As stated in the previous letter, no argument was provided by Michael Mansfield QC as to why the debate was "well set out and fair" – it was an opinion, not an argument. We

questioned whether this statement was given from an unbiased perspective (and provided reasons), much like you have questioned Dr Andrew Bennett, not on his arguments, but on his capacity to provide an unbiased opinion as a researcher.

You note that there is an error in the X-Cape website. We note that Jerry Vlasak's position within Europeans For Medical Advancement is clearly stated in a [letter in the Telegraph](#), dated September 2003, and thus cannot merely be an error of the X-Cape website.

As mentioned previously, it may also be useful for you to begin to compile a list of 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 stroke extending to the right.

Wendy Jarrett