

When a poll was taken in America, 75% of people were against the testing of cosmetics on animals ("Cosmetic Animal Testing - Cosmetic Industry"). With so many people against animal testing, why is it still legal? In many European countries, testing products on animals is outlawed. However, everyday in the United States helpless animals, including rabbits, guinea pigs, and rats, are harmed or killed by cosmetic companies. Annually, this adds up to millions of animals killed in unreliable safety tests by cosmetic companies ("Cosmetic Testing"). I am passionate about the issue of cosmetic testing on animals because as a high school female, I use many different cosmetic products like the majority of females my age. Women of all ages use cosmetics, but most are unaware of the cruelty inflicted on animals so that women can buy their favorite product from the store. These tests continue only because the public is unaware of the pain inflicted on animals by the cosmetic companies during beauty product research. I believe that we should not perform harmful cosmetic testing on animals, just to appease our own selfish desires. Cosmetic testing on animals has occurred since the 1930's and it continues, despite the availability of more humane and reliable tests. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA), which is suppose to monitor animal testing, does not require safety tests for cosmetics to be performed on animals. Cosmetic companies have been saying for decades that it is necessary to perform safety tests on animals, but I believe that we should use the proven alternative methods for testing to save millions of animals annually.

Prior to the 1930's cosmetics were not tested for safety. Women were buying beauty products that often contained harmful ingredients. In 1933, Lash Lure mascara was the new cosmetic necessity for women. Lash Lure was made to darken lashes, but

frequent side effects including burning feeling in eyes, infections, blindness, and in some cases death ("All For Animals"). At the time, cosmetics were unregulated and the ingredients used in their manufacture could cause harm. With public safety considered, the Food and Drug Administration passed the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in 1938 to protect the public from unsafe cosmetics ("All For Animals"). This new law required that all cosmetics be tested for safety before released on the market. It did not require products to be tested on animals, but allowed companies to administer tests as long as test were "appropriate and effective for substantiating the safety of their products." This law did not address the issue of animal welfare, only the end result which was suppose to make products safe for human use ("Cosmetics Q&A: Animal Testing"). This was the beginning of testing of products on animals by the cosmetic industry.

The cosmetic industry uses two types of testing on animals for their products. These tests are called the Draize Test and Lethal Dose 50 ("Cosmetic Testing"). Companies administer these tests on many animals including rats, rabbits, guinea pigs, and dogs. They continue to use the cruel testing methods, though these tests are not always accurate. Dr. Michael Ball from the European Center for the Validation of Alternative Methods believes alternative methods should be used and states, "The scientific basis" for use of animals for cosmetic safety testing is "weak" ("Cosmetic Testing"). The majority of tests for eye shadows are performed on rabbits to observe the reactions, and most sun screen trials are performed on guinea pigs to view the skin irriation and allergic reaction to the product. ("Cosmetic Animal Testing - Cosmetic Industry"). During the Draize Test, a liquid or powder substance is dropped into the eyes of rabbits. Then, the reaction to the substance is recorded over an average of 72 hours,

but the experiment can last from seven to eighteen days. For the entire experiment, the rabbits are mobilized with only their heads exposed, and their eyes are kept open with clips. Many rabbits break their necks trying to escape from the experiment. No anesthesia is given during this test, and the reaction of this test can include: swollen eyelids, bleeding, or blindness. These test results can vary from lab-to-lab and even rabbit-to-rabbit making this test unreliable. The other common cosmetic test is the Lethal Dose 50, also known as LD50 or a toxicity test. During this test, a substance is forced into an animal through injections into the skin, breathing vapors, or adding into the lab chow. LD50 tests are performed until fifty percent of animals who are involved in these tests die, which is usually between two and four weeks. A few of the reactions the animals may have from the LD50 test include: diarrhea, skin irritation, or bleeding from the eyes, nose, or mouth. The results of these tests are unreliable because the reaction of animals from the test does not determine the human health hazards of the product, only animal reactions. Often the test results are unreliable and inconclusive ("Cosmetic Testing"). Both of these tests are highly criticized, so many large cosmetic corporations hire outside companies to perform the animal testing to reduce the liability of the cosmetic company. ("Cosmetic Animal Testing - Cosmetic Industry").

The Food and Drug Administration has made efforts to make cosmetics safer with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. This law requires cosmetic companies to test each ingredient for safety using any types of tests the companies see necessary, or the companies must label the product safety as 'undetermined'. Cosmetic companies do not want to label a product's safety as undetermined for fear customers may then view product as unsafe and it could potentially damage sales, thus they

continue to conduct the tests that are harmful to the animals. Also, animal testing is much more expensive than alternative methods of testing. Experts say that it may cost up to \$1000 per animal to run certain tests ("Technology Review: Cosmetics Testing without Animals"). Furthermore, animals do not have the same reactions to products as humans, and animals in the labs are created to endure numerous experiments, so their breed is tougher and stronger. This manipulated breed corrupts the results of the safety ("Cosmetic Animal Testing - Cosmetic Industry"). Though the FDA does not ban testing on animals, it encourages cosmetic manufactures to find alternatives to animal testing. If companies resort to the use animals, the FDA suggests they should attempt to use the least amount of animals to find the most amount of information. Without guidelines, animal testing remains unregulated, with no one protecting the animals. Though the FDA has guidelines for animal testing, there are no laws banning it ("Cosmetic Testing").

There are many alternatives to the testing of cosmetics on animals. Robert Freedman, a researcher is looking to find alternative testing methods states, "There is, beyond that, the powerful ethical demand ... that it just shouldn't be done... If we're smart enough to go to the moon, then we should be smart enough to test chemicals without hurting other creatures." He believes that a newly developed chip could replace animal skin irritation tests. If used one time, this chip could save 25 animals lives ("Technology Review: Cosmetics Testing without Animals"). This is one of over two-dozen methods that proven by scientists as better alternatives to animal testing. These new alternatives can replace animal testing or make it more humane for the animals. Also, companies do not need any tests if they make products from ingredients approved safe by the FDA ("Animal Testing: The Beginning of the End? | The Humane Society of the United

States”). In Europe, they are currently phasing out all animal tested cosmetic products, and their goal is for all animal testing banned by 2013. The United States has made an effort to follow in Europe’s tracks, but it is far behind. Programs that are in place to ban animal testing in the United States are severely underfunded, and the federal government has made little effort to protect these animals (“Non-Animal Testing Methods | The Humane Society of the United States”).

For decades, cosmetic companies have performed unreliable safety tests on animals, but I believe we should use the alternative methods to save millions of animals annually. In today’s society, people have many luxuries, and this can blind them from bigger issues. Women around the world buy brands of cosmetics because it may be one of their favorites, or it may just catch their eye in the store. But most do not think about the helpless animals that are put through traumatic safety tests to get the customer their favorite product. Many companies are initiating non-animal safety testing. I buy all of my cosmetics from companies that do not test on animals. Two of my favorite companies are E.L.F. cosmetics and Bare Essentials, both use alternative safety testing. A complete list of companies that do not test on animals can be found at www.peta.com. I strongly believe that if we all come together, we can stop cosmetic animal testing. We should encourage the FDA to enact strict regulations on the tests companies perform. The testing of cosmetics on animals is an issue that needs to be handled now for the welfare of the animals.

Works Cited

- "All For Animals." *Animal Rights and Cruelty-free Living: All For Animals - Santa Barbara, California*. Web. 29 Mar. 2010. <<http://www.allforanimals.com/history.html>>.
- "Animal Testing: The Beginning of the End? | The Humane Society of the United States." *The Humane Society of the United States : The Humane Society of the United States*. Web. 28 Mar. 2010.
<http://www.hsus.org/animals_in_research/animal_testing/animal_testing_the_beginning_of_the_end.html>.
- "Cosmetic Animal Testing - Cosmetic Industry." *ClearLead, Inc. - Search Engine Optimization(SEO) | Internet Website Marketing Firm*. Web. 29 Mar. 2010.
<<http://www.clearleadinc.com/site/cosmetic-animal.html>>.
- "Cosmetic Testing." *Mercy For Animals - Animal Rights Organization Promoting a Vegetarian Diet*. Web. 29 Mar. 2010. <http://www.mercyforanimals.org/cosmetic_testing.asp>.
- "Cosmetics Q&A: Animal Testing." *U S Food and Drug Administration Home Page*. Web. 29 Mar. 2010.
<<http://www.fda.gov/Cosmetics/ResourcesForYou/Consumers/CosmeticsQA/ucm167216.htm>>.
- "Non-Animal Testing Methods | The Humane Society of the United States." *The Humane Society of the United States : The Humane Society of the United States*. Web. 28 Mar. 2010.
<http://www.hsus.org/animals_in_research/animal_testing/alternatives.html>.
- "Technology Review: Cosmetics Testing without Animals." *Technology Review: The Authority on the Future of Technology*. Web. 29 Mar. 2010.
<<http://www.technologyreview.com/biomedicine/24384/?a=f>>.