



I will make several assumptions. First, researchers and animal care personnel frequently become attached to their nonhuman subjects. The most extensive study of these relationships was conducted by the sociologist Arnold Arluke, who investigated the culture of animal care in several dozen biomedical research facilities (Arluke 1988, 1990). He found that it was common for an animal to be singled out by

Two schools of thought have dominated contemporary philosophical discussion over the moral status of an animal. Both schools have taken the "pure reason" approach to ethics (see Russow 1999 for an excellent review of these and other approaches to the debate over the moral status of nonhuman animals). Peter Singer, author of the enormously

However, they also make a convincing argument that we have additional obligations to some animals based on the fact that we have personal relationships with them

subjects of repeated student surgeries (current practice in most schools is to euthanize a laboratory animal after a single operation). The veterinary school where Helen works

owners or companions, and that accords them special moral

technician would be interested in the procedure. In reality,



Galvin S, Herzog H. 1992. The ethical judgment of animal research. *Ethics Behav* 2:263-286.

Gilligan C. 1982. In *A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University.

Iliff SA. 2002. An additional "R": Remembering the animals. *ILAR* 43: 38-47.

Lehman H. 1992. Scientists-animal bonding: Some philosophical reflec-

SCAW [Scientists Center for Animal Welfare]. 1997. Preliminary Report: Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee Survey.

Serpell J. 1996. *In the Company of Animals*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University.

Singer P. 1981. *The Expanding Circle: Ethics and Sociobiology*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Singer P. 1990. *Animal Liberation*. New York, New York: Basic Books.