



mal uses. Last, a way forward will be discussed for national competent authorities and policy makers to take advantage of this scoring system. Ideally, defining criteria can identify good practices and being shared among other MS so that new and specific steps towards replacement are ongoing.

Reference

Taylor, K. (2014). EU member state government contribution to alternative methods. *ALTEX 31*, 215-218. doi:10.14573/al-tex.1401061

Presentation: Posters

796

Difficult paradigm shift? Reasons for continued animal use for educational purposes revealed in non-technical summaries

*Miriam A. Zemanova*¹, *Andrew Knight*² and *Susanna Lybæk*³

¹Animalfree Research, Bern, Switzerland; ²University of Winchester, Winchester, United Kingdom; ³The Norwegian Animal Protection Alliance (Dyrevernulliansen), Oslo, Norway

miriam.andela.zemanova@gmail.com

Animals have been considered instrumental in serving as a tool to learn knowledge and skills of living organism functioning as well as in human and veterinary medicine for millennia (Hart et al., 2008). However, animal use in education has been recently criticized by students, scientists, educators, philosophers and policy makers on ethical, economic and environmental grounds (Oakley, 2013; Sapontzis, 1995; Tolbert, 2019). Replacement of animals in education should be easy considering the variety of the non-harmful alternatives that are currently being developed and successfully implemented. And yet, every year thousands of animals continue being used for the purposes of education and training in the European Union alone (European Commission, 2020). The aim of this study was to understand why this is the case. In order to answer this question, we analyzed recently published non-technical summaries, which all EU Member States are obliged to publish in line with the Directive 63/2010 EU. Data from 249 non-technical summaries from 18 EU and EEA Member States published in 2017-2019 revealed that the most often cited barriers to implementation of animal-free alternatives are: 1) practice on living animals is necessary for proper learning or 2) there is no adequate model currently available. In majority of the cases, the latter argument is however invalid, and I will provide specific examples in my presentation to demonstrate that. In conclusion, it is necessary to put a stronger emphasis on engagement with ethical questions that underlie the use of animals and careful consideration of how the learning objectives could be achieved through non-harmful alternatives.

References

- European Commission (2020). 2019 Report on the statistics on the use of animals for scientific purposes in the Member States of the European Union in 2015-2017. In *Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council*. EC, Brussels.
- Hart, L. A., Wood, M. W. and Hart, B. L. (2008). *Why Dissection? Animal Use in Education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Oakley, J. (2013). "I didn't feel right about animal dissection". Dissection objectors share their science class experiences. *Soc Anim 21*, 360-378. doi:10.1163/15685306-12341267
- Sapontzis, S. F. (1995). We should not allow dissection of animals. *J Agr Environ Ethics 8*, 181-189. doi:10.1007/bf02251882
- Tolbert, S. (2019). Queering dissection: "I wanted to bury its heart, at least". In C. Taylor, C. Amade-Escote and A. Abbas (eds.), *Gender in Learning and Teaching: Feminist Dialogues Across International Boundaries*. London, UK: Routledge.

Presentation: Posters

798

The ethics of non-human primate research

*Angela N. Hvitved*¹ and *Adam Shriver*²

¹William H. Miller III Department of Philosophy, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, United States; ²Centre for Applied Ethics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

angela.hvitved@gmail.com

The use of non-human primates (NHPs) for research poses important ethical questions. In recent years, these ethical considerations have led to increased scrutiny and diminished public support of NHP research. Yet, reliance on NHP research continues and, in some scientific domains, is increasing. Ethical considerations are crucial in shaping public policy and in the United States, there is increasing pressure to better align NHP research policy with our current understanding of the ethical implications of this work.

To support this effort, our report "The Ethics of Non-human Primate Research" examines the various ethical features of NHP research from the perspective of different ethical frameworks that influence our moral understanding and, subsequently, public policy. The report opens with an overview of how key ethical frameworks consider issues of harm and moral status, and then examines the ethically salient features of NHP research. By guiding readers through examples of how different ethical frameworks might reflect on the specific features of various research contexts, it provides an opportunity for those outside the field of professional ethics to consider the unique ethical features of NHP research. The ethical analyses provided are grounded in our current understanding of the cognitive and behavioral capacities