

Ladies and gentlemen, honorable judges, and esteemed opponents,  
Today, I stand before you to present the opposing viewpoint on the ethics of animal testing. While the intent of animal testing--to advance human health and safety--is undeniably significant, the means through which we achieve this goal deserve careful scrutiny.

Firstly, animal testing frequently subjects living creatures to pain, suffering, and permanent harm, raising serious ethical concerns. Animals, like humans, experience fear, distress, and pain. Subjecting them to invasive procedures often without adequate anesthesia or aftercare is in direct conflict with basic principles of compassion and humanity.

Moreover, the relevance and applicability of animal test results to human conditions are often questionable. Physiological differences between species can lead to results that might not correspond to human reactions. This discrepancy not only questions the validity of such tests but also points toward a waste of resources and lives.

Additionally, in the 21st century, we have access to advanced technological alternatives that can replace animal testing. Methods like in vitro testing, computer modeling, and human-tissue-based methods are not only ethically superior but often provide more accurate and reliable data relevant to human biology.

In conclusion, while the aim of safeguarding human health is noble, the current practice of animal testing is fraught with ethical issues and scientific limitations. It's time we reconsider our approach and embrace more humane and effective alternatives.

Thank you.