

*instance, the animals' experiments would be ensuring that there would be an effective cure for the entire humans, who are considered to be more productive and larger in number than the small sample that would be researched. So according to the utilitarianism theory, the sacrificing of animals for the purpose of science would be moral and ethical, as it would be leading to higher benefits than costs. Simply, the end justifies the mean (Ritskes-Hoitinga, Zurlo, Clark, & Griffin, 2014). On the other hand, the animals' experiments can't be justified throughout the benefits that would be witnessed by the people. Throughout the animals' experiments, there are different unethical actions that are being conducted by the researchers. Firstly, the use of the animals is not benefiting, by anyhow, the animals. Secondly, the theory of the utilitarianism had been reversed by the theory of deontology, which stated that the end doesn't justify the mean, as the end and the means should be moral and ethical. Thirdly, distinguishing between the humans and animals based on the productivity and effectiveness can be realized as an unethical ideology. For instance, the less usefulness of the species doesn't make them enforced to be sacrificed for the sake of any other species. Based on this theory, it can be argued that the less productive people or the people with mental disorder should be used in the experiments, as they will be benefiting the highly productive people.*

*To conclude, it should be ensured that the animals are considered to be benefiting the humans in variety of means, which may be deployed for many purposes, rather the scientific experiments. The elimination of the animals from the experiments can be replaced by other means, throughout the use of technological systems. The advancements and growth of technology that had been witnessed ensure that the*