

Short Research Article

Animal and Human Psychology

ABSTRACT:

Research on animals may harm the animals if proper care of them is not taken. It's really riveting to know more about the animal behavior, but sometimes we humans injure the animals knowingly or unknowingly. We should respect an animal's freedom, as most animals are caged or are separated from their family, while the researchers do their job.

Keywords: - Animals, human

INTRODUCTION:

Have you ever wanted to communicate with an animal? Be it a pet or some random street animal, we all have tried to talk to an animal to see if it understands us or not. We have only seen these epic human-animal talk in movies such as "Spirited Away", "Doctor Dolittle", etc.

Now communication with animals has become a reality. We try to communicate and understand how an animal feels, behaves, how it adapts to different habitats (Wachman, 2018). Animal psychologists are fascinated by these lovely creatures who live in the deep canopies and detritus of forests (Wachman, 2018).

Many of us have heard the saying, "A dog is a man's best friend". But more than docile animals are 'friends' with man (Archer, 1997; Udell et al., 2008; Groves, 1999). Many humans have bonds with the beasts of the jungle, and they are known as the Animal Psychologists (Archer, 1997).

THE BOND OF ANIMALS AND HUMANS:

Psychologists have studied many animals which varies from our ancestors, the chimps, to other animals (Archer, 1997). They study animals so that they can find out two things:

1) *The capability of an animal's mind.* Many pet owners have faced the difficulty of teaching an animal some human 'manners' (Udell et al., 2008). Researchers have spent centuries studying animals in vain (Archer, 1997). But psychologists are attached to animals and vice-versa (Udell et al., 2008).

II) **An animal's emotions.** Psychologists sense the perspective of animals by talking to them and studying their reactions towards the different 'emotion filled' animal calls (Groves, 1999).

ANIMALS WHICH ARE THE FAMOUS FOR THEIR TALENTS:

Hans the Horse:

Psychologists have been fascinated by how animals are truly capable of human-like feats (Groves, 1999). In the early 1900s, a horse named 'der kluge Hans' which translates to Clever Hans, answered all the questions asked of him in, dramatic fashion, through his public performances in Berlin (Samhita and Gross, 2013). He was trained by a mathematician, Wilhelm Von Ofsten. This brilliant horse became more talented, as he could perform simple arithmetic, and tell the time by using his hooves to tap the ground (Agrillo and Miletto Petrazzini, 2012). Hans could also identify painters by seeing their paintings or identify the composer of a symphony. The German Board of Education assessed Hans's capabilities, but there was no evidence of fraud (Samhita and Gross, 2013).

Pavlov's Dogs:

In the 1870's, a Russian psychologist, Ivan Pavlov studied dogs (Samhita and Gross, 2013). Pavlov's reason for studying dogs in most of his introductory psychology classes and his textbook is due to dogs ability to understand and learn using the principle of classical (operant) conditioning (Samhita and Gross, 2013). Pavlov discovered classical condition by accident (McLeod, 2018). He noticed that the dogs salivate as a response to cues such as the ringing of bells, the smell of food, etc. This has become challenging for other psychologists (Samhita and Gross, 2013).

Washoe the Chimp:

The deaf and mute use sign language to communicate, and some researchers wondered if this language could be taught to animals (Gökselet et al., 2009). In the early 20th century, an experiment was devised to answer a question. Are primates capable of learning human language if they were raised in human culture (Gökselet et al., 2009). This prompted a research team, Luella and Winthrop Kellogg, to raise the chimp Gua alongside their son (McLeod, 2018). It ended in failure, with Gua unable to speak. Decades later, animal researchers realized that non-human primates would never speak because of the different anatomy of their mouth and vocal chords (McLeod, 2018).

Recognition of this anatomical fact led to an intense period of work to teach apes sign language and, later, communication by symbols on a picture board (Gökselet et al., 2009). The first chimp to be taught sign language was Washoe. Washoe hailed from West Africa and was adopted by a psychology researchers, Allen and Beatrix Gardner (Gardner and Gardner, 1969). Washoe eventually learned to use over 250 different signs. There is disagreement over whether Washoe ever really invented new words,

such as the time she allegedly signed “water”, “bird” at the sight of a swan (Gökselet et al., 2009).

Koko the Gorilla:

Most of the ape language studies have involved chimps, but one particularly famous exception is Koko the Gorilla, who was taught sign language and English for decades by the psychologist Francine Patterson (Specter, 2014). A few years ago, Koko made headlines around the world when it was alleged by the Gorilla Foundation in California that she was mourning the passing of actor and comedian Robin Williams, who she’d met for an afternoon in 2001 (Specter, 2014). A YouTube clip of their encounter has been viewed over three million times. Koko has also starred in her own books, including a children’s book, *Koko’s Kitten*, and has been the subject of several film documentaries, most recently a BBC program *Koko: The Gorilla who talks to people* (Specter, 2014). “What we can really learn from this extraordinary science experiment turned love affair?” asks the film, highlighting in a nutshell one key problem with this entire field – the emotional closeness between researchers and the animals they study, which challenges the pursuit of scientific objectivity (Specter, 2014).

The sad thing about the story of Koko and the other apes made famous by their part in psychological studies is that the whole field has ‘crashed’, not only because of the methodological criticisms, but also amid accusations of animal mistreatment (Specter, 2014). A recent Slate article summed up the situation: “No new studies have been launched in years, and the old ones are fizzling out. A behind-the-scenes look at what remains of this research today reveals a surprisingly dramatic world of lawsuits, mass resignations, and dysfunctional relationships between humans and apes.” Similarly, a major new paper in *Annual Reviews of Anthropology* by Don Kulick states, “The threadbare field left today is an alarming not-so-fun house of intrigue, betrayal, accusation, threats, litigation, dismissals, obese apes, dead apes, mass resignations, and even, inevitably, sex.”

Peter the Dolphin:

Sex is also a surprising theme of dolphin research that took place in the 1960s at a lab known as Dolphin House, built on the Caribbean island of Saint Thomas (Specter, 2014). There, John Lilley and his wife conducted investigations into whether dolphins are capable of mimicking human speech, and later into the effects of LSD on dolphins (Specter, 2014). As part of the language research, a woman called Margaret Howe Lovatt moved into a specially designed dolphinarium with a young male dolphin called Peter, living there more or less 24 hours a day in an office that was perched above his water tank. The idea was that with constant human contact, it would perhaps be possible for a dolphin to fully grasp and imitate human language. One problem: the pup’s burgeoning sexual needs began to interrupt the language lessons (Specter, 2014). At first Peter was intermittently relocated to spend time with female dolphins in another tank, but Lovatt found that this interfered too much with her research and the

bond she was trying to establish, so she began to satisfy Peter's needs herself (Riley, 2014). "It wasn't sexual on my part. Sensuous perhaps," she told Christopher Riley, the producer and director of the BBC documentary, *The Girl Who Talked To Dolphins*. "It seemed to me that it made the bond closer," she continued. "Not because of the sexual activity, but because of the lack of having to keep breaking. And that's really all it was. I was there to get to know Peter. That was part of Peter."

This isn't just an odd tale, but a sad one. As Lovatt's experiment was coming to an end, news came that funding was being withdrawn from the lab (Specter, 2014). The following year, Dolphin House lab was forced to close. Reports note that after being moved to claustrophobic surroundings in Miami, Peter took his own life.

Alex the Parrot:

Language skills and a keen intelligence are not only the preserve of apes and dolphins, as shown – to many experts' surprise at the time – by the remarkable achievements of the African Grey parrot Alex (an acronym for "Avian Learning Experiment"), who was studied for 30 years by the psychologist Irene Pepperberg, until the parrot's death in 2007 at the age of 31. Pepperberg, who bought Alex from a pet store in 1977, was apparently inspired to study Alex because she'd read about the linguistic achievements of Washoe and other animals. As well as being famous for his one liners, Alex apparently learned over 100 words, could name over 50 objects and knew his colors and shapes (Callaway, 2012). He starred in several BBC and PBS documentaries (Callaway, 2012). Like many of his ape peers in the research world, Alex also received notable obituaries upon his death (Callaway, 2012). *The Economist* referred to him as science's "best known parrot" (Callaway, 2012). *The New York Times* ran with "Brainy parrot dies, emotive till the end", in reference to the fact that Alex's last words to Pepperberg the night he died were "You be good, see you tomorrow. I love you." (Callaway, 2012).

Compared with his ape peers, it seems that Alex contributed to research that is more likely to stand the test of time (Callaway, 2012). He was featured in dozens of quality peer-reviewed papers by Pepperberg (Callaway, 2012). In his recent review of human-animal communication, anthropologist Don Kulick wrote the "... emphasis on cognition and downplaying of language seem to have protected Pepperberg's studies [of Alex] from the sort of critical onslaught that pulverized ape-language research" (Callaway, 2012).

Betty the Crow:

Alex is far from being the only smart bird in town (Hunt and Gray, 2004). Betty, the New Caledonian crow, though less famous than the parrot, made headlines around the world in 2002 when it was reported that she had displayed ingenuity in fashioning a hook out of a straight piece of wire, to reach food in a plastic tube, because another crow had taken the hook provided by the researchers (Hunt and Gray, 2004). This was considered a 'big deal', because as one of the researchers told BBC, "Although many animals use

tools, purposeful modification of objects to solve new problems, without training or prior experience, is virtually unknown” (Hunt and Gray, 2004). In fact, the researchers claimed Betty’s tool-making was more impressive than the tool use seen among chimps (Hunt and Gray, 2004).

However, as usual with animal research of this kind, doubts have been raised about the way Betty’s feat was interpreted. In 2017, a different team of researchers studied 18 new Caledonian crows as they made tools with the branches they use in the wild. The researchers observed that most of the birds performed the same final modification – to create a hook shape – as seen by Betty in the lab. In other words, Betty’s feat was not entirely spontaneous, but probably part of her species’ natural repertoire. Meanwhile, while we’re talking about corvids, an honorable mention should go to psychologist Nicky Clayton’s scrub-jays, who have been observed demonstrating many behaviors previously considered uniquely human, such as advanced deceit. For instance, a jay would re-hide her food stash if a potential thief was nearby when she first hid it (Hunt and Gray, 2004).

Echo the Elephant:

Echo the Elephant had been filmed and observed in Kenya’s Amboseli National Park for several decades, making her the world’s most studied elephant. Echo, who was her tribe’s matriarch for about 36 years, starred in at least four documentaries, including David Attenborough’s, “Echo: An Unforgettable Elephant”. The principal researcher was ethologist Cynthia Moss who, like many of the other researchers mentioned in this list, formed a powerful emotional bond with Echo (Hunt and Gray, 2004). Moss learned from Echo and the other elephants of Amboseli about their emotional lives, their transmission of cultural practices and their capacity for future planning and teamwork (Moss, 1992). This is illustrated in a video clip (Hunt and Gray, 2004), in which Echo marshals the support of her tribe’s adult females to execute an apparently daring rescue of her daughter, Ebony, who had been kidnapped by a rival tribe. Echo died in 2009 at the age of 64 (Moss, 1992).

Harlow’s Monkeys

The importance of physical touch between mother and baby is today widely recognized, but back in the 1950s, this wasn’t the case. This is due in part to the influence of Freud and his ideas that an infant bonds with her mother primarily because the mother satisfies the infant’s basic needs of thirst and hunger (Shallcross, 2012). The American psychologist Harry Harlow’s research in the 1950s with rhesus monkeys changed this. Though ethically controversial, it provided a powerful demonstration of the importance of physical contact in mother-infant attachment (Shallcross, 2012).

Inspired by his observation that monkeys separated from their mothers grew highly attached to and possessive of their blankets, Harlow created two forms of surrogate mother: one made of wire that provided milk, another warm and soft surrogate that provided comfort but no milk. Given the choice, infant monkeys spent most of their time with the soft, warm version (Shallcross, 2012). However, without their mothers, even

the monkeys who clung to the cloth-covered surrogates developed serious behavioral problems later, lending graphic evidence to support the British psychologist John Bowlby's claims about the importance of early maternal care (Shallcross, 2012).

ANIMALS SUFFER WHILE THEY ARE BEING STUDIED:

TORTOROUS PROTOCOLS:

Animals are experimented on using drugs, burning of skin, causing brain damage, implanting electrodes into the brain, maiming, blinding, and other painful and invasive procedures. It can include protocols that cause severe suffering, such as long-term social isolation, electric shocks, withholding of food and water, or repeated breeding and separating of infants from mothers. In toxicity testing, animals used in chronic toxicity and carcinogenicity studies receive the test substance daily, seven days a week, for up to two years with no recovery periods. Many, if not most, animals die before the end of the study. Except for chimpanzees, animals who survive their use in research and testing can be killed after the study is completed (Shallcross, 2012).

Many animal experiments utilize restraining devices, designed to prevent an animal from moving. Some research projects call for immobilization of specific parts of an animal's body—head and neck, legs and pelvis—while other protocols involve immobilization of an animal's entire body. For example, researchers at several major U.S. universities have all conducted "stress experiments" on rats and mice (Shallcross, 2012). These experiments included immobilizing mice and rats in tubes, shocking their feet, suspending them by their tails, and forcing them to swim to avoid drowning (Shallcross, 2012). Researchers claimed these experiments had relevance to human anxiety and depression (Shallcross, 2012). Although restraint is particularly stressful and frustrating for an animal, some experiments are designed to hold animals in partial or total immobilization for months (Shallcross, 2012).

Anesthetization, intubation, and euthanasia are also common lab procedures which require extensive training and skill. When improperly performed, these procedures cause extreme pain and discomfort (Shallcross, 2012). For example, if a researcher uses a paralyzing agent on an animal but does not monitor vital signs to make sure it is adequately anesthetized, there is a great chance that the animal is actually experiencing pain but unable to move. Unfortunately, in some cases, the lab personnel often lack the experience and training—and sometimes the sensitivity—needed to avoid unnecessary animal suffering.

The areas of xenotransplantation (transplanting cells, tissues, or organs from one species into another species) and genetic engineering also create a great deal of suffering and death for animals. Genetic engineering consumes and destroys untold volumes of animals in attempts to create animals with specific traits. Nonhuman primates, cats, dogs, mice, rats, and others, have all been subjected to genetic manipulation. Many of these animals die, while suffering from abnormalities and other diseased conditions (Moss, 1992).

241 DAILY EXISTENCE:

242 Animals in labs suffer not only pain from protocols, but also severe stress from day-to-
243 day laboratory life (Moss, 1992). They spend their lives in barren cages, unable to make
244 choices or express natural behaviors. Most never experience fresh air or sunshine, only
245 bars and concrete. Those few facilities that provide some outside caging typically rotate
246 the animals, giving them limited and infrequent amounts of time outdoors (Moss, 1992).
247 Standard lab conditions, such as small, crowded cages, lack of enrichment, loud noises,
248 and bright lights out of sync with natural lighting are all known to create stress in
249 animals who in turn show physical symptoms of stress, including chronic inflammatory
250 conditions. Studies show that mice are capable of empathy and become even more
251 stressed when witnessing other mice in distress. Other research documents the long-
252 lasting effects on chimpanzees from the stress and trauma of living in a lab and being
253 used in research and testing. In 2009, an undercover lab investigation revealed
254 monkeys frantically spinning around and around in their cages, biting open wounds,
255 mutilating themselves, and ripping out their own hair, all because of the chronic
256 psychological distress they endure. The term used for this is “stress-induced
257 psychosis”—laboratories are literally driving these animals crazy. After seeing footage
258 of chimpanzees from this same investigation, famed primatologist Dr. Jane Goodall
259 stated, “In no lab I have visited have I seen so many chimpanzees exhibit such intense
260 fear. The screaming I heard when chimpanzees were being forced to move toward the
261 dreaded needle in their squeeze cages was, for me, absolutely horrifying”.

262 For all animals trapped in labs, their day-to-day existence is traumatic in itself—even
263 without their forced participation in one dreaded protocol after another. They
264 experience ongoing mental and physical suffering from the endless boredom,
265 confinement, fear, and emotional stress of daily laboratory life. Add to this the fear and
266 agony of a procedure, and only then can we start to understand the desperation and
267 pain in which they live, every day—and for most, for their entire lives.

268 LEGAL PROTECTION: REALITY OR RHETORIC:

269 The Animal Welfare Act (AWA) of 1966 (P.L. 89-544) is the only federal law that
270 provides even minimal protection for animals in laboratories. The United States Public
271 Health Service’s (PHS) Policy on the Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals
272 covers animals in National Institutes of Health (NIH)-funded research, but the PHS does
273 not conduct inspections itself. Instead, it relies on institutions to inspect their own labs.
274 However, it specifically excludes rats, mice, and birds bred for research, who constitute
275 90-95 percent of animals in labs. For the approximately 10 percent of warm-blooded
276 animals in labs who are covered under the AWA, the law covers animal
277 husbandry only—meaning specific standards for their housing, feeding, and handling,
278 including veterinary care. It does not prohibit any kind of experiment regardless of the
279 amount of pain or distress it might cause. Instead, it requires oversight committees
280 (called Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees [IACUCs]) to review and approve
281 research protocols. These are composed of and overseen by the research facility itself
282 and are widely regarded as “rubber stamp” committees. Their members are primarily
283 animal researchers, and the research facility’s CEO selects everyone on the committee.
284 As a result, IACUCs allow most proposed experiments, regardless of the amount of

suffering they inflict. If deemed “necessary” to the study, researchers can even withhold pain medication.

According to USDA’s latest available figures (2009), 7.8 percent of all AWA covered animals in labs underwent painful procedures without the benefits of pain relief. However, it is assumed that the degree of pain endured is grossly underreported, as no objective criteria is in place to guarantee accurate perception and reporting of pain and suffering. Under current federal law, the administration of pain relief is discretionary, rather than mandatory. When a researcher or attending veterinarian feels that analgesics, anesthesia, or tranquilizers will confound the results of an experiment, pain relief can be legally withheld. This concept of “necessary pain” is basic to the spirit of the AWA, which specifically states that its intent is not to regulate or restrict the planning and performance of experimental designs and protocols. One career researcher, for example, reported chronic diarrhea in monkeys in labs as “normal”. Another claimed the “rocking back and forth” is something “they just do”—researchers are inured to the suffering animals in labs endure. In short, while the AWA and the IACUC system purports to ensure “humane” treatment of animals in labs, this system is so limited and so plagued with loopholes that these animals have little or no protection.

Research shows that people accept animal research only when they think that animals do not suffer, and that it’s scientifically necessary. In fact, they do suffer, and it is not necessary. We can attest to this today in a way that we never could in the past. The New England Anti-Vivisection Society (NEAVS) science team has methodically looked at the use of animals in research and published papers in peer-reviewed journals that demonstrate that animal research is not necessary, is not predictive for humans, and is often irrelevant, inaccurate, or even dangerous for human health. The facts make it clear that we can save animals and humans when we replace animal research with alternative methods that deliver effective, predictive, human-relevant results. In short, we can end the harm and suffering of the animals and better benefit human health.

MY INSIGHT OF ANIMAL AND HUMAN PSYCHOLOGY:

According to the research I have done, I have learned a lot about the pros and cons of animal research.

THE PROS:

We can get to know them more and understand their behavior. Intelligence of animals can be useful for humans too. We can give our love to them as they give us their love to us. We can get to know their comfort and emotions. Animals can become our best friends if we take care of them.

323 **THE CONS:**

324 Firstly, animals are taken far away from their natural habitat and especially family. I
325 was watching Animal Planet, and a researcher was studying hyenas. Compared to the
326 information I had read, his method of researching was the best in my opinion. He
327 studied the hyenas by keeping them in their natural environment and had caged himself
328 instead of the hyenas. We humans can adapt easily by using technology, but animals
329 lack that capability and take time to adapt, and from what I have learned, if an animal is
330 not able to adapt itself to its surroundings, it could be fatal. Another drawback of animal
331 research is that they have are given drugs and medications in some experiments. This
332 could cause a lot of permanent and painful damage to the animal's body. We do need to
333 know more about animals, but we need to be careful, as they are not toys, we can't just
334 break them and try to fix them. They are living beings just like us. They have emotions
335 too.

336

337 **SUMMARY/OPINION:**

338 Animals have a right to respectful treatment...this inherited value is not respected when
339 animals are reduced to being mere tools in scientific experiments. Animals and people
340 are alike in many ways; they both feel, think, behave, and experience pain. Therefore,
341 animals should be treated with the same respect as humans. Yet animals' rights are
342 violated when they are used in research because they are not given a choice. Animals
343 are subjected to tests that are often painful or cause permanent damage or death, and
344 they are never given the option of *not* participating in the experiment. Animals don't
345 willingly sacrifice themselves for the advancement of our race.

346 Animals feel pain in many of the same ways that humans do; in fact, their reactions to
347 pain are virtually identical. Two of the most commonly used toxicity tests are the Draize
348 test and the LD50 test, both of which are infamous for the intense pain and suffering
349 they inflict upon experimental animals. In the Draize test the substance or product
350 being tested is placed in the eyes of an animal, generally a rabbit is used for this test,
351 then the animal is monitored for damage to the cornea and other tissues in and near the
352 eye. This test is intensely painful for the animal, and blindness, scarring, and death are
353 generally the end results. The Draize test has been criticized for being unreliable and a
354 needless waste of animal life. The LD50 test is used to test the dosage of a substance
355 that is necessary to cause death in fifty percent of the animal subjects within a certain
356 amount of time. To perform this test, the researchers connect the animals to tubes that
357 pump huge amounts of the test product into their stomachs until they die. This test is
358 extremely painful to the animals because death can take days or even weeks. According
359 to Orlans, the animals suffer from vomiting, diarrhea, paralysis, convulsion, and internal
360 bleeding (Since death is the required endpoint, dying animals are not put out of their
361 misery by euthanasia. The LD50 test is "scientifically unjustifiable". The precision it
362 purports to provide is an illusion because of uncontrollable biological variables". The
363 use of the Draize test and the LD50 test to examine product toxicity has decreased over

the past few years, but these tests have not been eliminated completely. Thus, because animals are subjected to agonizing pain, suffering and death when they are used in laboratory and cosmetics testing, animal research must be stopped to prevent more waste of animal life.

The testing of products on animals is completely unnecessary because viable alternatives are available (Shallcross, 2012). Many cosmetic companies, for example, have sought better ways to test their products without the use of animal subjects (Shallcross, 2012). In 'Against Animal Testing', a pamphlet published by 'The Body Shop', a well-known cosmetics and bath-product company based in London (Shallcross, 2012), the development of products that "use natural ingredients, like bananas and Basil nut oil, as well as others with a long history of safe human usage" is advocated instead of testing on animals. Furthermore, the Draize test has become practically obsolete because of the development of a synthetic cellular tissue that closely resembles human skin (Shallcross, 2012). Researchers can test the potential damage that a product can do to the skin by using this artificial "skin" instead of testing on animals. Another alternative to this test is a product called Eyetex. This synthetic material turns opaque when a product damages it, closely resembling the way that a real eye reacts to harmful substances. Computers have also been used to simulate and estimate the potential damage that a product or chemical can cause, and human tissues and cells have been used to examine the effects of harmful substances. Another method, in-vitro testing, is used to perform cellular tests inside a test tube. Each of these alternative tests have been proven to be useful and reliable alternatives to testing products on live animals. Therefore, because effective means of product toxicity testing are available without the use of live animal specimens, testing potentially deadly substances on animals is unnecessary.

Many people believe that animal testing is justified because the animals are sacrificed to make products safer for human use and consumption. The problem with this reasoning is that the animals' safety, well-being, and quality of life is generally not a consideration. Others respond that animals themselves benefit from animal research. Yet in an article entitled, "Is Your Experiment Really Necessary?", Sheila Silcock, a research consultant for the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA), states: "Animals may themselves be the beneficiaries of animal experiments. But the value we place on the quality of their lives is determined by their perceived value to humans". Making human's lives better should not be justification for torturing and exploiting animals. The value that humans place on their own lives should be extended to the lives of animals as well.

Still other people think that animal testing is acceptable because animals are lower species than humans and therefore have no rights. These individuals feel that animals have no rights because they lack the capacity to understand or to knowingly exercise these rights. However, animal experimentation in medical research and cosmetics testing cannot be justified on the basis that animals are lower on the evolutionary chart than humans since animals resemble humans in so many ways. Many animals, especially the higher mammalian species, possess internal systems and organs that are identical to the structures and functions of human internal organs. Also, animals have

feelings, thoughts, goals, needs, and desires that are like human functions and capacities, and these similarities should be respected, not exploited, because of the selfishness of humans. Tom Regan asserts that, “animals are subjects of a life just as human beings are, and a subject of a life has inherent value. They are ends in themselves”. Therefore, animals’ lives should be respected because they have an inherent right to be treated with dignity. The harm that is committed against animals should not be minimized because they are not considered “human”.

Conclusion

Animal testing should be eliminated because it violates animals' rights, it causes pain and suffering to the experimental animals, and other means of testing product toxicity are available. Humans cannot justify making life better for themselves by randomly torturing and executing thousands of animals per year to perform laboratory experiments or to test products. Animals should be treated with respect and dignity, and this right to decent treatment is not upheld when animals are exploited for selfish human gain. After all, humans are animals too. Comfort, love, freedom, their home and nature are the basic thing animals need to survive. But we take them away for our benefit. Give them all they need, and they would live a happy life. They would even cooperate and show you their talents. Think of them as introverts, they are just not ready for the sudden change. Give them time and they would be as close to you as possible.

References

- Wachman, Monica. (2018, March 13). Animals That Live in the Canopy Layer of the Rainforest. Sciencing. Retrieved from: <https://sciencing.com/animals-live-canopy-layer-rainforest-6707037.html> - Accessed: November 28, 2018
- Archer, J. (1997). Why do people love their pets. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 18, 237-259.
- Udell, M. A. R., Dorey, N. R., & Wynne, C. D. L. (2008). Wolves outperform dogs in following human social cues. *Animal Behaviour*, 76, 1767-1773.
- Groves, C. P. (1999). The advantages and disadvantages of being domesticated. *Perspectives in Human Biology*, 4, 1-12.
- Specter, M. (2014). Drool. Ivan Pavlov’s real quest. *The New Yorker*. November 24, 2014. Retrieved from: <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/11/24/drool> - Accessed: November 28, 2018
- Samhita, L., & Gross, H. J. (2013). The “Clever Hans Phenomenon” revisited. *Communicative & integrative biology*, 6(6), e27122.

Agrillo C, Miletto Petrazzini ME. The importance of replication in comparative psychology: the lesson of elephant quantity judgments. *Front Psychol.* 2012; 3:181. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00181

McLeod, S. A. (2018, Oct 08). *Pavlov's dogs*. Retrieved from: <https://www.simplypsychology.org/pavlov.html> - Accessed: November 28, 2018

Göksel, A. Kelepir, M. & Üntak-Tarhan, A. (2009) Interrogatives in Turkish Sign Language: the specific functions of head tilt, head shake and head nod. Presented at the Workshop on Non-Manuals in Sign Languages, Goethe University, Frankfurt A.M., April 2009.

Gardner, R. A., & Gardner, B. T. (1969). Teaching sign language to a chimpanzee. *Science*, 165 (3894), pp. 664-672.

Christopher Riley, 2014. Web link: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/jun/08/the-dolphin-who-loved-me>.

Callaway, E. (2012). Alex the parrot's last experiment shows his mathematical genius. *Nature News Blog*, 20.

Hunt, G. R., and Gray, R. D. (2004). The crafting of hook tools by wild New Caledonian crows. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 271 (Suppl 3), S88-S90.

Moss, C. (1992). *Echo of the elephants: The story of an elephant family*. William Morrow.

Shallcross, W. (2012). What can be learned from a single case of psychoanalytic infant observation?. In *Infant Observation and Research* (pp. 85-96). Routledge.