Article Week 2

<https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2019/09/us-epa-eliminate-all-mammal-testing-2035>

**Questions**

1. There are many pros and cons when testing chemicals and other products on animals. Defend one side of the argument, are you for or against animal testing?

2. One of the alternatives to animal testing stated in the article is computer programs/simulations, do you believe that this will suffice or is subject testing required? Why?

3. The end of the article mentions that non animal testing techniques are not developed enough to ban animal testing but something has to change. Is there any way to compromise and use the best of both worlds(non animal and animal testing) or does this situation heavily lean on one side or the other? Explain.

4. If hazardous chemicals made it into the consumer and public world because non animal testing did not predict a hazardous result on humans, who would be at fault the producer or the EPA for not allowing them to use animal testing?

5. EPA’s vice president Goodman is advocating for the ban of animal testing, specifically mammals, but states that he expects testing on fish to continue. Do you think that the push for non animal testing would be as strong as it is now if it was done on animals that do not receive as much compassion from the majority people like fish or any other non mammals?