

---

**Tekst 1**

---

**Animal betrayal**

Sir, It is a strange state of affairs that Dr Jarrod Bailey, Scientific Adviser of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, should agree with the Academy of Medical Sciences, which asserts that experiments with "humanised" genetically modified (GM) animals for research must be carefully controlled. Why does he not demand that they be abolished?

Further, he states that replicating in animals genetic "faults" that cause diseases in humans is poor science and rarely does this replicate human pathology and symptoms of diseases. Of course, because this is entirely artificial; the results having nothing in common with spontaneously arising diseases in humans.

But he muddies the water by saying that the genetic "faults" rarely replicate human pathology. This implies that sometimes they do, but Dr Bailey neglects to say which these are. This opens the door to ever more animal experimentation, which casts an aura of acceptability on a practice his organisation was founded to oppose without compromise. What a betrayal of its founders' hopes his letter represents.

HENRY TURTLE

London SW24

adapted from *The Times*, 2011

---

**Tekst 1 Animal betrayal**

---

- 1p 1 "Animal betrayal" (titel)  
In welke zin wordt het gevolg genoemd van de toepassing van genetische modificatietechnieken voor dieren?  
Citeer de eerste twee woorden van deze zin.