

An Analysis of Animal Testing In Beauty Products and It's Ethicality

By Erin White

Introduction/Problem Statement

Some feel that animal testing is a reliable and quick way to make sure that products are ready for consumption, while others believe it is unnecessary due to alternative forms of testing. Is it time to retire the practice completely? Research shows that sustainability is popular amongst consumers (Sheehan & Lee, 2014).



Research Question

Is Animal Testing Ethical?

Method

- ❖ I utilized the Sacred Heart Databases in order to conduct my research.
- ❖ I only used peer reviewed current sources.
- ❖ When a source proved specifically useful, I used the reference list for further research.

Literature Review Themes

- 1) History of Animal Testing and Current Legislation
- 2) Pros and Cons Arguments
- 3) Current updates on Alternatives
- 4) Consumer Behavior and Sustainability

Major Literature Review Findings

- ❖ Animal testing and experimentation has been recorded as early as Ancient Greece (Hajar, 2011).
- ❖ The EU is the current driving force of abolishing animal testing through legislation (Innis, 2019).
- ❖ While Animal Testing is necessary for biomedicine, it is not explicitly needed for cosmetics (Get the Facts, 2021).
- ❖ Once animals are proven no longer useful, they are disposed of by asphyxiation, neck-breaking, or decapitation (Innis, 2019).
- ❖ The Animal Welfare Act does not protect 95% of animals used for testing (ie. Rodents, birds, and fish) (Of mice and model organisms, 2019).
- ❖ In Vitro methods of testing are actively being optimized in order to create an alternative to skin sensitization testing (Pfuhler et al., 2014).
- ❖ The term "sustainability" is seen as a "positive buzzword", meaning it makes consumers feel admirable when purchasing a seemingly sustainable product (Pantelic et al., 2016).
- ❖ Research proves that sustainability is a persuasive marketing trope (Sheehan & Lee, 2014).



Conclusions/Suggestions for future research

In conclusion, animal testing is proving to be a subjectively unethical practice. While it is necessary for fields such as biomedicine (*Get the Facts, 2021*), it is not necessarily needed to produce cosmetics. Due to recent technological advancements, alternative testing methods, such as In Vitro assays, have been able to test the skin sensitization of certain chemicals used in cosmetics (Pfuhler et al., 2014). According to recent studies, sustainability and cruelty-free marketing have proven to be extremely persuasive amongst consumers (Sheehan & Lee, 2014). Non-cruelty-free companies should use this finding as motivation to step away from the mistreatment of animals and adopt more sustainable practices. In the next coming years, It is expected to see significant advancement in the alternative testing methods.

References

- Animal Testing Facts and Statistics*. PETA. (2020, November 25). <https://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-experimentation/animals-used-experimentation-factsheets/animal-experiments-overview/#:~:text=Each%20year%2C%20more%20than%20100,%2C%20food%2C%20and%20cosmetics%20testing.>
- Animal Welfare Act | Animal Welfare Information Center | NAL | USDA*. (2013). Usda.gov. <https://www.nal.usda.gov/awic/animal-welfare-act>
- Bloodhart, B., & Swim, J. K. (2020). Sustainability and Consumption: What's Gender Got to Do with It? *Journal of Social Issues*, 76(1), 101–113. <https://doi-org.sacredheart.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/josi.12370>
- Coronavirus vaccine clinical trial starting without usual animal data- STAT*. (2020, March 11). STAT.
- Einhorn, B. (2020, March 11). *A Virus Cure Depends on Rare Lab Mice, But There Aren't Enough*. Bloomberg.com; Bloomberg. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-03-11/a-coronavirus-cure-depends-on-rare-mice-but-there-aren-t-enough>
- Ezendam, J., Braakhuis, H. M., & Vandebriel, R. J. (2016). State of the art in non-animal approaches for skin sensitization testing: from individual test methods towards testing strategies. *Archives of Toxicology*, 90(12), 2861–2883. <https://doi-org.sacredheart.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s00204-016-1842-4>
- Get the Facts*. (2021). Ca-Biomed.org. <https://ca-biomed.org/get-the-facts/>
- Hajar R. (2011). Animal testing and medicine. *Heart views : the official journal of the Gulf Heart Association*, 12(1), 42. <https://doi.org/10.4103/1995-705X.81548>
- Humane Cosmetics Act introduced in the US Senate and House. (2020). *ALTEX: Alternatives to Animal Experimentation*, 37(1), 146.
- Innis, J. K. (2019). “Not Tested on Animals”: The Future of Cosmetic Animal Testing in the U.S. And beyond. *Suffolk Journal of Trial & Appellate Advocacy*, 25(1), 92.
- Kleinstreuer, N. C., Hoffmann, S., Alépée, N., Allen, D., Ashikaga, T., Casey, W., Clouet, E., Cluzel, M., Desprez, B., Gellatly, N., Göbel, C., Kern, P. S., Klaric, M., Kühnl, J., Martinozzi-Teissier, S., Mewes, K., Miyazawa, M., Strickland, J., van Vliet, E., ... Petersohn, D. (2018). Non-animal methods to predict skin sensitization (II): an assessment of defined approaches *. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 48(5), 359–374. <https://doi-org.sacredheart.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/10408444.2018.1429386>
- Of mice and model organisms - Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory*. (2019, July 31). Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory. <https://www.cshl.edu/of-mice-and-model-organisms/>
- Pantelic, D., Sakal, M., & Zehetner, A. (2016). Marketing and sustainability from the perspective of future decision makers. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 47(1), 37–47. <https://doi-org.sacredheart.idm.oclc.org/10.4102/sajbm.v47i1.51>
- Pros and Cons of Animal Testing - Latest Research in Ongoing Debate*. (2013, October 22). *PR Newswire*.
- Pros & Cons - PROCON.ORG*. (2020, June 10). <https://animal-testing.procon.org/>.
- Pfuhler, S., Fautz, R., Ouedraogo, G., Latil, A., Kenny, J., Moore, C., Diembeck, W., Hewitt, N. J., Reisinger, K., & Barroso, J. (2014). The Cosmetics Europe strategy for animal-free genotoxicity testing: Project status update. *Toxicology in Vitro*, 28(1), 18–23. <https://doi-org.sacredheart.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/j.tiv.2013.06.004>
- Seidle, T. (2013). Humane Society International's global campaign to end animal testing. *Alternatives to Laboratory Animals : ATLA*, 41(6), 453–459. <https://doi-org.sacredheart.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/026119291304100608>
- Sheehan, K. B., & Lee, J. (2014). What's cruel about cruelty-free: An exploration of consumers, moral heuristics, and public policy. *Journal of Animal Ethics*, 4(2), 1.
- Taylor, K. (2016). Can the ADAPT principles help with the implementation of 3Rs in regulatory testing? *Toxicology Letters*, 258, S309. <https://doi-org.sacredheart.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/j.toxlet.2016.06.2056>