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Howard, Carol. "Alternative Testing Can Replace Animal Experimentation.” *Animal Experimentation.* Ed. Ronnie D. Lankford, Jr. Farmington Hills: Greenhaven Press, 2009. 14 and 15. Print.

Howard’s article contains a description of the use of alternative means to animal testing for cosmetic use. She includes information on the three types of alternatives, how to go about enforcing them, and even how to inform future generations of the dangers that animal testing presents.

This article has authority because Howard is a coordinator at the Johns Hopkins Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing in Baltimore, Maryland. Therefore, Howard deals with this type of data and information in her occupation on a daily basis, which shows that she has expertise on the subject. Her article seems to be valid because in my attempt to cross-check sources, I found a recent Internet article from a science magazine that listed the same “Three R’s” of alternatives to animal testing. She also lists a bibliography consisting of various informational texts. I believe Howard’s audience was intended to be a generalized one and that she has provided sufficient evidence through her analysis of the current situation with animal testing. It is possible that there is a sort of bias that the author presents because she works for an animal testing alternative research center. However, in the beginning of the article she states a personal story about how her father, reacting when she landed her job at the Johns Hopkins Center, said that he didn’t believe alternatives could work. This is proof that she understands that some people view the issue differently, but she continues by stating her own opinions based on given facts. This article was published in 2009, so it is rather current in formation.

This source will be useful because it supports my thesis that animal testing for cosmetic use is not acceptable when there are existing alternatives.

Begley, Sharon. “These Rats Die for Our Sins.” *Newsweek.* 116.17 (1990):68.  *Military & Government Collection.* Web. 21 Nov. 2011.

This article describes in-depth the argument that rats used for cosmetic experimentation have been found to eventually have cancer. It goes on to explain that this cancer is not a result of exposure to the substances that are tested on them, but because of the massive dosages of these substances that they receive.

Sharon Begley is a credible author because she has served as the science columnist and science editor of *Newsweek* and as the author of two books on the subject of the human mind, which shows her expertise in scientific studies. Therefore, it can be assumed that she, if not having background on the subject, was able to conduct thorough enough research to produce this article because of her leadership position. This information also seems to be accurate because in cross-checking the study about this link between mice and cancer through cosmetic research I found various other Internet sources that also used this study. I believe Begley’s coverage is in-depth because there is much evidence presented through statistics and quotes taken from scientists in the field. This source is also objective because it is merely analyzing the study that was released about laboratory tested mice and their probability of developing cancer. The intent of this article is merely to inform a generalized audience of a new scientific study; therefore, it is objective. This article is not entirely current, because it was published in 1990, but the facts of the study do not change, which means that it is still relevant information to my research.

This article can be useful when writing my research paper because of its foundation in scientific data that supports my stance against the use of animal testing.

Lewis, Paul and Jha, Alok. “Scientist Backs Animal Testing for Cosmetics.” *The Guardian.* 3 March 2006. Web. 21 Nov. 2011.

This article presents an argument for the use of animal testing. It includes testimony from an Oxford-based neurosurgeon who states his reasons as to how animal testing is relevant and useful in today’s society.

This article has authority because both authors are respectable science journalists for *The Guardian* and have written many other credible published articles. This source information is accurate because I have found biographies of Tipu Aziz, the scientist that they quote in the article, which express his beliefs to the same effect. The information covered in this article is sufficient mostly because it continuously quotes Professor Aziz and then comments upon his words in a way that is informative to any audience. It is also clear that this article’s main point is to inform the public that there are reasons for animal testing and that some expert scientists, such as Professor Aziz, approve of animal testing. Even though the article doesn’t really explain both sides of the issue, it does not seem to be biased because it is simply the reporting of one scientist’s opinion of the use of animal testing. It is a current article because it was published in 2006.

I believe that this source will be helpful in writing my research paper because it will give me opposing information to my argument. It is important to touch upon opposing arguments in order to not be biased in writing, so this article can keep my argument from being too one-sided.

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. "Product Testing on Animals Is Cruel and Unnecessary." *Animal Experimentation*. Ed. David M. Haugen. Farmington Hills: Greenhaven Press, 2000. Reprinted, with permission, from "Product Testing: Toxic and Tragic," a factsheet from the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals website

This article basically sums up an argument against cosmetic research by use of animals. It thoroughly describes current testing methods and a few alternatives.

This article is a credible source because the information used came directly from a People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) factsheet. This organization is well-known in the United States and has authority. This source is also accurate because the current tests and alternatives included are the same or similar to those that I have found throughout my research process. Also, because this information was posted as a PETA factsheet, the data should be valid. This also proves that the information covered in the article is efficient and comprehensive. Furthermore, the intent of this article is simply to inform an audience of proven facts about the use of animal testing, which proves objectivity. Additionally, this article was published in 2000, so it is not completely current but facts are facts; therefore the information provided is relevant to my argument.

I believe that this source can be helpful to my argument because it is rather descriptive of both current and alternative tests. These are pieces of information that I would like to describe in my own paper. It will definitely help me in trying to prove my thesis.

Welsh, Heidi J. *Animal Testing and Consumer Products.* Washington D.C. Investor Responsibility Research Center Inc. 1990. 50, 61 and 63. Print.

This book source completely explains arguments for and against animal testing, statistics and data from various animal rights organizations, current tests, alternatives, and stories about actual companies who have used animal testing.

I believe that this text has authority because Welsh is a credible author who put a lot of time and effort into the completion of this informational text. She was a research analyst at Investor Responsibility Research Center (IRRC) at the time of this publication. I believe that this information is accurate because being a research analyst, Welsh would be required to find accurate and useful information as her daily job. Therefore, I think that her authoring of this book should reflect her responsibilities on the job. Also, the tests listed in this book are the same or similar to those that I have found in my research of this topic. The information in this text seems to be very in-depth, because the entire book is devoted to animal testing for product research, which is vital to my thesis. This also demonstrates that the text is objective because it is informative and covers both sides of the animal testing issue. The only negative aspect of this source is that it is not current. It was published in 1990. However, if I find any inconsistencies with the book and other newer sources, I will be sure to make sure I update the information in my own paper.

I believe that this source will be extremely helpful because of how in-depth the analysis of the issue of animal testing is presented. Also, stories from actual companies can serve as useful examples in my paper.