

Association for the Abolition of Animal Experiments

President: Christopher Andereg, M.D., Ph.D.
Founded in 1979 under the name of CIVIS

Ostbühlstr. 32, 8038 Zurich
www.animalexperiments.ch

Tel. + Fax: 044 482 73 52
Postal Account: 80-18876-5

Zurich, February 12th, 1997

NOTE: The AAVS never responded to this letter.

The American Anti-Vivisection Society
ATT: Ms. Tina Nelson, Executive Director
801 Old York Road #204
Jenkintown, PA
U. S. A.

Re: «Alternative methods» and the «3Rs» (Refine, Reduce, Replace)

Dear Ms. Nelson:

I am an AAVS Life Member and director of the above antivivisection organization in Zurich, Switzerland. I am also a former animal experimenter (I conducted animal experiments at Wesleyan College in Middletown, CT; at Yale University in New Haven, CT; at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich; and at the Institute for Biomedical Research of the Swiss pharmaceutical company Hoffmann-La Roche in Basle). I renounced my career in 1989 in order to fight for the total abolition of animal experiments on medical and scientific grounds.

This goal I pursue through the publication of full-page advertisements in Swiss magazines and newspapers, in which I expose the dangers and fraudulence of animal experimentation. I also publish full-page ads exposing the fraudulence of so-called «alternative methods», which are dangerously misleading and in fact contribute nothing to the promotion of truly scientific methods or to the elimination of animal use and suffering in biomedical research and product testing.

It was therefore with the greatest astonishment and disappointment that I received the latest issue of the *AV Magazine* extolling and endorsing the dangerously deceptive «3Rs» (Refine, Reduce, Replace) and «alternative methods» – due mainly to the misguided efforts of the late AAVS president William Cave and of Dr. John McArdle, director of AAVS's *Alternatives Research & Development Foundation*.

The reason for my consternation is simple: *Those who endorse the 3Rs and support the research and development of alternative methods acknowledge animal experimentation as a useful and necessary method which cannot be abolished, but only gradually and partially refined, reduced and replaced with alternative methods of equal value.* This dangerous endorsement of the alleged usefulness and necessity of animal experiments is all too apparent in a statement published in the April 1991 issue of the Swiss journal *Alternatives to Animal Experiments* by the British organization FRAME (headed by Dr. Michael Balls), a staunch supporter of the 3Rs and alternative methods:

. / .

FRAME acknowledges that a complete abolition of all animal experiments could endanger today's medical research, which is necessary for the conquest of diseases, and that products must be sufficiently tested on animals to ensure a proper assessment of the risks they might pose to humans and animals.

On the one hand, you state correctly in the Jan./Feb. 1996 issue of the *AV Magazine* (page 1): «As we are all aware, extrapolating data from laboratory animals to humans is scientifically fraudulent.» *Logic and common sense therefore dictate that a scientifically fraudulent method not be replaced with another equally worthless and fraudulent method, but rather abolished.* On the other hand, you state in the latest issue of the *AV Magazine* (page 1): «The AAVS is, and always has been, an abolitionist organization whose definition of the 3Rs is replacement, replacement, replacement.»

Antivivisectionists must reject alternative methods and the 3Rs for the following reasons:

1. Most alternative methods are based not on truly scientific methods like human cell and tissue cultures and clinical investigations of human patients, but rather on *animal* cell and tissue cultures and computer models, which are of (more or less) *equal value to the worthless and fraudulent animal experiments* they are supposed to replace.

2. For the so-called *evaluation and validation* of alternative methods – a process which takes years, if ever, to complete – the scientists not only compare the data from their alternative methods with the data from animal experiments, but they also *repeat* the very animal experiments their alternative methods are supposed to replace, in order to obtain additional data for the purpose of further comparisons! *This endless and absolutely senseless repetition of animal experiments over a period of years – despite masses of data from decades of previous animal experimentation – leads to neither the reduction nor the replacement, but rather the perpetuation of animal experiments.*

3. Despite the fact that animal experiments themselves have never been evaluated or validated with respect to their relevance and reliability for humans, the authorities responsible for the evaluation and validation of alternative methods will acknowledge and officially accept an alternative method *if and only if it yields the same results as the animal experiment it is supposed to replace. Since animal experiments are scientifically fraudulent, alternative methods therefore contribute only to the perpetuation of scientific fraudulence.*

Although alternative methods and the 3Rs are clearly detrimental both to the abolition of animal experiments on medical and scientific grounds and to animal protection in general, it is astounding that an ever increasing number of animal rights, animal protection and even antivivisection organizations like your own are not only endorsing the 3Rs, but are also promoting and financing the research and development of alternative methods.

In conclusion, I have no illusions that my lone voice of protest will encourage you to reconsider your policy and change your dangerous and detrimental course. However, until and unless you do so, I can no longer support the AAVS in any form whatsoever.

Sincerely yours,



Christopher Anderegg, M.D., Ph.D.,
President & Director