

Dear For Life on Earth,

Thank you for your [response](#).

Let us be clear on the order of events culminating in our agreement to this debate. At 8.01am 15th October 2013, @forlifeonearth tweeted:



We responded at 9.43am the same day, tweeting:



Your EDM did not set out a motion to be debated. However, the 30 debates we helped to organise last year were on the motion, *“This House Would Ban All Forms of Animal Research”*, which I believe is FLOE’s ultimate aim? And the video you sent us has one of your spokespeople calling for a *“properly moderated public debate between scientists on both sides asking them to provide evidence that animal experiments benefit medical research”*.

Thus we have said that we are happy to debate on either the motion: *“This House Would Ban All Forms of Animal Research”*, or *“Do animal experiments benefit medical research?”*

Are we to understand that For Life on Earth and Ray Greek are not able to debate either of these broad-ranging motions?

I would note that we have not agreed to your specific list of conditions for the debate (which we note were created six months after we agreed to debate). We think these conditions run into some fundamental issues, such as the feasibility of providing all the information to be debated in advance as well as verifying all references that may be used, before the debate. As expressed before, we do not agree with Michael Mansfield QC that the debate is “well set out and fair”. It may follow the process used in a court of law, but it is not what anyone involved in debating in the UK would recognise as normal procedure. If a process is to be agreed in advance, we would suggest that the House of Commons or the House of Lords would provide better models.

Your suggestion that the Concordat on Openness on Animal Research is ‘empty and valueless’ is quite an insult. 85 signatory organisations involved in veterinary, medical and scientific research using animals spent eighteen months working very hard to agree the Concordat’s commitments to openness and transparency on this issue, a process that involved two rounds of public research. Its Foreword was written by the Government’s Chief Scientific Advisor and it was supported by the Home Office Minister Norman Baker, as well as being widely welcomed on all sides of the political spectrum.

The fact that we cannot definitely commit a main speaker for the debate at this stage is not at all to do with any of the UK’s senior medical research scientists being unwilling to take part, it is because we have not yet agreed any logistical details for the debate. Surely you cannot seriously expect such senior scientists to clear their diaries for an indefinite period while you decide whether or not you can debate either of the motions that we agreed to almost a year ago? Our speaker is likely to depend on their availability on the date set. Having neither agreed on the motion, nor the conditions, we are not yet in a position to be able to agree a date.

We remind you that the thirty debates organised by UK University debating societies last year as part of the Big Animal Research Debate aimed to discuss both the scientific and moral issues relating to animal research.

We remain curious as to why you feel the arguments of a scientist who has conducted animal research, but now works towards ending it, are not appropriate?

We also continue to voice our concern that Ray Greek’s organisation, Europeans for Medical Advancement, has previously had the convicted animal rights extremist, Jerry Vlasak, [within their ranks](#).

As mentioned previously, it may also be useful for you to begin to compile a list of potential moderators so that we can find those mutually agreeable to both of us.

Yours sincerely,



Wendy Jarrett