



Understanding Animal Research
Hodgkin Huxley House
30 Farringdon Lane
London EC1R 3AW

Telephone **020 3675 1230**
Facsimile **020 3411 7808**
Email **info@uar.org.uk**
www.understandinganimalresearch.org.uk

Dear For Life on Earth,

Thank you for your [response](#).

Understanding Animal Research accepted a challenge to a debate on the motion “Do animal experiments benefits medical research?” This is the question asked directly by one of FLOE’s campaigners, Alex Irving. Given this was the [video](#) we replied to, it was reasonable to assume this was the question to be debated.



EDM 263 does not have any motion within it, and editing together different portions of the EDM wording, as your previous response did, will not change this. Are we to assume that For Life on Earth are not prepared to oppose the motion that “animal experiments benefit medical research”? Given the context of the Big Animal Research Debate, we also accept the motion, “*This House Would Ban All Forms of Animal Research*”, which, as previously stated, I believe is FLOE’s ultimate aim.

Are we to understand from your response that For Life on Earth and Ray Greek are not able to debate either of these broad-ranging motions?

I remind you that we did not agreed to your specific list of conditions for the debate (which we further note were created six months after we agreed to debate). We think these conditions run into some fundamental issues, such as the feasibility of providing all the information to be debated in advance as well as verifying all references that may be used, before the debate. As expressed before, we do not agree with Michael Mansfield QC that the debate is “well set out and fair”. It may follow the process used in a court of law, but it is not what anyone involved in debating in the UK would recognise as normal procedure. If a process is to be agreed in advance, we would suggest that the House of Commons or the House of Lords would provide better models.

Understanding Animal Research has engaged in many debates. Most recently, on Thursday 30th October 2014, Understanding Animal Research participated in a panel discussion/debate co-organised by Cambridge Young Greens and Animal Rights Cambridge. This was organised at short notice and discussed the question “can we justify the way we use and treat animals for research

purposes?" Given the open question and standard debate conditions, we were able to be involved in this productive and open debate.

Understanding Animal Research agreed to participate in your event. The scientists we will be asking to represent our side of this debate have not yet agreed to anything. They wish to have further details of the debate including a final agreed motion, time, date, location, structure, moderators, etc.

Finally, Understanding Animal Research is unhappy at the most recent [Change.Org petition](#) by Rebecca Groves (one of the organisers of the intended FLOE debate). Neither our staff, nor our governance, appreciate receiving dozens of emails urging us to "stop wasting time" in agreeing the terms of a debate. We have been very clear on our terms and are concerned by your efforts to narrow the scope of discussion. We ask that you remove this change.org petition lest it jeopardise ongoing efforts to move forward with this debate.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Wendy Jarrett', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Wendy Jarrett