

Tekst 6

Four legs good, two legs bad



Britain is the best place in the world to be a laboratory animal, but the worst place to breed one

- 1 AROUND 30 years ago, the Hall family diversified from dairy and sheep farming into breeding guinea pigs for use in research laboratories. Six years ago, they became the target of animal rights activists. They have been abandoned by frightened suppliers and employees and lost their entire dairy herd, which was slaughtered when their tormentors made it impossible for the milk to be collected. This week, the family gave up its struggle, saying that by the end of the year they would stop breeding guinea pigs at Darley Oaks Farm.
- 2 The brutality of the Hall's treatment at the hands of animal rights campaigners would never be suffered by one of their animals inside a British laboratory. Live animal research is more tightly regulated in Britain than anywhere else in the world. Before an experiment, the research laboratory

must show it has the facilities and staff to care for the animals; the researcher must show he has the skills and training; and there must be no alternative to using animals – with the likely benefits of the science outweighing any animal suffering.

- 3 22, researchers must seek more efficient methods that involve fewer animals, look for more humane procedures and work towards developing completely new forms of experimentation that do not call for animals.
- 4 But not all live animal research can be replaced. Although surgical techniques can sometimes be learned by practising on cadavers, microsurgery requiring careful control of bleeding needs living animals.
- 5 One disease under study is cystic fibrosis, which is caused by one of around 200 defects on a single gene. It has no satisfactory treatment, and sufferers cannot expect to live much past 30. Researchers can now create mice with the same genetic defects and

test potential treatments on them, or study the progress of the disease. This research could not be carried out on tissue cultures, as the disease affects several organs, and nor could it be done on humans – at least, not without killing them to study the results.

6 That amounts to a strong case for animal experimentation, you might think. Certainly 700 scientists and doctors sought to argue as much in a declaration this week. But it doesn't take very many extremists to make life unpleasant. The police reckon that around 20 fanatics are responsible for most of the damage. They now realise that terrorism proper is unlikely to help their cause. So they have developed ways of scaring people that stop short of threatening lives – damaging property by pouring paint on cars, say, or sending fake bombs to laboratory workers.

7 Although the extremists do not enjoy much support, many people share their aims. In part that's because animal rights extremists fought hard for a ban on foxhunting, which was widely supported. In 2002 a MORI poll

for the Coalition for Medical Progress showed that 67% of people were either very or fairly concerned about the use of animals in research – though almost everyone accepts that this is sometimes needed.

8 It is hard to avoid the conclusion that reducing animal suffering is not the activists' main concern. If it is, they have made a poor choice of target. Domesticated cats alone kill around 300m animals each year in Britain, including around 80m mice, 15m rabbits and 3m rats. And forcing British suppliers of laboratory animals to close will lead to more animals being imported, with an increase in suffering.

9 Since extremists first targeted small animal-breeders, in 1997, they have closed down four outfits, breeding dogs, cats, monkeys and rabbits. The longest any of the companies lasted was two years.

10 The Halls held out at Darley Oaks Farm for six years. In that sense their resistance has been a triumph, albeit a dismal one.

The Economist

Tekst 6 Four legs good, two legs bad

- 1p 20 “the family gave up its struggle” (last sentence of paragraph 1)
Why?
A They could no longer cope with the problems caused by animal campaigners.
B They did not approve of breeding animals for experiments any more.
C They kept losing workers who disagreed with their farming methods.
D They were unable to meet new rules for the breeding of laboratory animals.
- 1p 21 What is the purpose of paragraph 2?
To argue that
A animal rights campaigns have had a substantial effect in Britain.
B Britain imposes very strict conditions on animal experimentation.
C British laboratory animals need all the protection they can get.
D most breeders of laboratory animals in Britain behave responsibly.
- 1p 22 Which of the following fits the gap in paragraph 3?
A For example
B Furthermore
C Instead
- 1p 23 Leg (kort) uit wat de schrijver wil aantonen met alinea 5.
- 1p 24 Which of the following becomes clear about animal rights extremists from paragraph 6?
A They are a small group who might even kill people to achieve their goals.
B They are monitored so closely that they can no longer do much harm.
C They have already managed to convert quite a few medical experts.
D They have switched to using less physically violent tactics.
- 1p 25 Geef voor elk van de onderstaande uitspraken aan of deze wel of niet in overeenstemming is met de inhoud van alinea 7.
1 Animal campaigners’ protests against foxhunting have given them more credit with the general public.
2 The majority of Britons believe that animal experiments should not be restricted to medical research.
Noteer het nummer van elke bewering, gevolgd door “wel” of “niet”.
- 1p 26 Which of the following does the writer seem to suggest about animal rights activists in paragraph 8?
1 Their actions may be counterproductive.
2 Their motives might be different from what they seem to be.
A Both 1 and 2 are true.
B Only 1 is true.
C Only 2 is true.
D Neither 1 nor 2 is true.
- 1p 27 “albeit a dismal one” (laatste twee regels tekst)
Waarom ‘dismal’?