

## **CONTACT INFORMATION**

### **[Sample letter next page](#)**

#### **University of California, San Diego, School of Medicine**

Edward W. Holmes, M.D., Dean

Pepper Canyon Hall Room 464; 9500 Gilman Drive; La Jolla, California 92093-0602

ph: 858-534-1501; email: [lfelix@ucsd.edu](mailto:lfelix@ucsd.edu)

#### **Georgetown University School of Medicine**

Stephen Ray Mitchell, M.D., Dean

3900 Reservoir Rd., N.W.; Washington, DC 20057

ph: 202-687-1612; email: [mitchelr@georgetown.edu](mailto:mitchelr@georgetown.edu)

#### **Louisiana State University at New Orleans School of Medicine**

Larry H. Hollier, M.D.

533 Bolivar, Suite 362; New Orleans, LA 70112

ph: 504-568-4007; email: [lholl@lsuhsc.edu](mailto:lholl@lsuhsc.edu)

#### **Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences School of Medicine**

Larry Laughlin, M.D., Ph.D., Dean

4301 Jones Bridge Rd.; Bethesda, MD 20814

ph: 301-295-3016; email: [lLaughlin@usuhs.mil](mailto:lLaughlin@usuhs.mil)

#### **University of Mississippi Medical Center School of Medicine**

Daniel W. Jones, M.D., Ph.D.

2500 N. State St.; Jackson, MS 39216-4505

ph: 601-984-1010; email: [djones@ovc.umsmed.edu](mailto:djones@ovc.umsmed.edu)

#### **St. Louis University School of Medicine**

Patricia Monteleone, M.D., Dean

1402 S. Grand Blvd.; St. Louis, MO 63104

ph: 314-577-8201; email: [montelpl@slu.edu](mailto:montelpl@slu.edu)

#### **Sinai School of Medicine**

Kenneth L. Davis, M.D., Dean

One Gustave L. Levy Pl.; New York, NY 10029-6574

ph: 212-659-9003; email: [kenneth.davis@mssm.edu](mailto:kenneth.davis@mssm.edu)

#### **New York Medical College**

Ralph A. O'Connell, M.D., Dean

Administration Bldg.; Valhalla, NY 10595

ph: 914-594-4000; email: [oconnell@nymc.edu](mailto:oconnell@nymc.edu)

#### **Stony Brook University Health Sciences Center School of Medicine**

Richard N. Fine, M.D., Dean

Health Sciences Center, School of Medicine

Nicholls Rd.; Stony Brook, NY 11790

ph: 631-444-2080; email: [Richard.fine@stonybrook.edu](mailto:Richard.fine@stonybrook.edu)

**University of Rochester School of Medicine**

David S. Guzick, M.D., Ph.D., Dean  
601 Elmwood Ave., Box 706; Rochester, NY 14642  
ph: 585-275-0017; email: [david\\_guzick@urmc.rochester.edu](mailto:david_guzick@urmc.rochester.edu)

**Duke University School of Medicine**

R. Sanders Williams, M.D., Dean  
Box 2927 Med Center; Durham, NC 27710  
ph: 919-684-2455; email: [r.s.williams@duke.edu](mailto:r.s.williams@duke.edu)

**East Carolina University-The Brody School of Medicine**

Cynda Johnson, M.D., Dean  
600 Moye Blvd.; Greenville, NC 27834  
ph: 252-744-2201; email: [johnsoncyn@mail.ecu.edu](mailto:johnsoncyn@mail.ecu.edu)

**Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine**

Ralph I. Horwitz, M.D., Dean  
10900 Euclid Ave, BRB 113; Cleveland, OH 44106-4915  
ph: 216-368-2825; email: [rih1@po.cwru.edu](mailto:rih1@po.cwru.edu)

**University of Tennessee, Memphis, College of Medicine**

UT Health Science Center; 62 S. Dunlap, Suite 400; Memphis, TN 38163  
ph: 901-448-5543; email: [hherrod@utmem.edu](mailto:hherrod@utmem.edu)

**Texas A&M Health Science Center College of Medicine**

Christopher C. Colenda, M.D., M.P.H., Dean  
159 Reynolds Medical Bldg.; College Station, TX 77843-1114  
ph: 979-845-3431; email: [colenda@medicine.tamhsc.edu](mailto:colenda@medicine.tamhsc.edu)

**University of Texas Medical School at San Antonio**

William L. Henrich, M.D., M.A.C.P., Dean  
7703 Floyd Curl Dr.; San Antonio, TX 78229-3900  
ph: 210-567-4422; email: [henrich@uthscsa.edu](mailto:henrich@uthscsa.edu)

**Medical College of Wisconsin**

Michael J. Dunn, Dean  
8701 Watertown Plank Rd.; Milwaukee, WI 53226  
ph: 414-456-8213; email: [mdunn@mcw.edu](mailto:mdunn@mcw.edu)

**University of Wisconsin Medical School**

Philip M. Farrell, M.D., Dean  
1300 University Ave.; Madison, WI 53706  
ph: 608-263-4910; email: [pmfarrel@facstaff.wisc.edu](mailto:pmfarrel@facstaff.wisc.edu)

**ALL EMAILS IN THIS ALERT**

[lfelix@ucsd.edu](mailto:lfelix@ucsd.edu), [mitchelr@georgetown.edu](mailto:mitchelr@georgetown.edu), [lholl@lsuhsc.edu](mailto:lholl@lsuhsc.edu), [lLaughlin@usuhs.mil](mailto:lLaughlin@usuhs.mil),  
[djones@ovc.umsmc.edu](mailto:djones@ovc.umsmc.edu), [kenneth.davis@mssm.edu](mailto:kenneth.davis@mssm.edu), [oconnell@nymc.edu](mailto:oconnell@nymc.edu),  
[Richard.fine@stonybrook.edu](mailto:Richard.fine@stonybrook.edu), [david\\_guzick@urmc.rochester.edu](mailto:david_guzick@urmc.rochester.edu), [r.s.williams@duke.edu](mailto:r.s.williams@duke.edu),  
[johnsoncyn@mail.ecu.edu](mailto:johnsoncyn@mail.ecu.edu), [rih1@po.cwru.edu](mailto:rih1@po.cwru.edu), [hherrod@utmem.edu](mailto:hherrod@utmem.edu),  
[colenda@medicine.tamhsc.edu](mailto:colenda@medicine.tamhsc.edu), [henrich@uthscsa.edu](mailto:henrich@uthscsa.edu), [mdunn@mcw.edu](mailto:mdunn@mcw.edu),  
[pmfarrel@facstaff.wisc.edu](mailto:pmfarrel@facstaff.wisc.edu)

Dear University Dean:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**University of California, San Diego, School of Medicine**

Edward W. Holmes, M.D., Dean  
Pepper Canyon Hall Room 464; 9500 Gilman Drive  
La Jolla, California 92093-0602  
ph: 858-534-1501; email: [lfelix@ucsd.edu](mailto:lfelix@ucsd.edu)

Dear Dr. Holmes:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**Georgetown University School of Medicine**

Stephen Ray Mitchell, M.D., Dean  
3900 Reservoir Rd., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20057  
ph: 202-687-1612; email: [mitchelr@georgetown.edu](mailto:mitchelr@georgetown.edu)

Dear Dr. Mitchell:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

## Louisiana State University at New Orleans School of Medicine

Larry H. Hollier, M.D.  
533 Bolivar, Suite 362  
New Orleans, LA 70112  
ph: 504-568-4007; email: [lholl@lsuhsc.edu](mailto:lholl@lsuhsc.edu)

Dear Dr. Hollier:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences School of Medicine**

Larry Laughlin, M.D., Ph.D., Dean  
4301 Jones Bridge Rd.  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
ph: 301-295-3016; email: [l laughlin@usuhs.mil](mailto:l laughlin@usuhs.mil)

Dear Dr. Laughlin:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**University of Mississippi Medical Center School of Medicine**

Daniel W. Jones, M.D., Ph.D.

2500 N. State St.

Jackson, MS 39216-4505

ph: 601-984-1010; email: [djones@ovc.umsmed.edu](mailto:djones@ovc.umsmed.edu)

Dear Dr. Jones:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**St. Louis University School of Medicine**

Patricia Monteleone, M.D., Dean  
1402 S. Grand Blvd.  
St. Louis, MO 63104  
ph: 314-577-8201; email: [montelpl@slu.edu](mailto:montelpl@slu.edu)

Dear Dr. Monteleone:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**Sinai School of Medicine**

Kenneth L. Davis, M.D., Dean  
One Gustave L. Levy Pl.  
New York, NY 10029-6574  
ph: 212-659-9003; email: [kenneth.davis@mssm.edu](mailto:kenneth.davis@mssm.edu)

Dear Dr. Davis:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**New York Medical College**

Ralph A. O'Connell, M.D., Dean  
Administration Bldg.  
Valhalla, NY 10595  
ph: 914-594-4000; email: [connell@nymc.edu](mailto:connell@nymc.edu)

Dear Dr. O'Connell:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**Stony Brook University Health Sciences Center School of Medicine**

Richard N. Fine, M.D., Dean  
Health Sciences Center, School of Medicine, Nicholls Rd.  
Stony Brook, NY 11790  
ph: 631-444-2080; email: [Richard.fine@stonybrook.edu](mailto:Richard.fine@stonybrook.edu)

Dear Dr. Fine:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**University of Rochester School of Medicine**

David S. Guzick, M.D., Ph.D., Dean  
601 Elmwood Ave., Box 706  
Rochester, NY 14642  
ph: 585-275-0017; email: [david\\_guzick@urmc.rochester.edu](mailto:david_guzick@urmc.rochester.edu)

Dear Dr. Guzick:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**Duke University School of Medicine**

R. Sanders Williams, M.D., Dean  
Box 2927 Med Center  
Durham, NC 27710  
ph: 919-684-2455; email: [r.s.williams@duke.edu](mailto:r.s.williams@duke.edu)

Dear Dr. Williams:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**East Carolina University-The Brody School of Medicine**

Cynda Johnson, M.D., Dean  
600 Moye Blvd.  
Greenville, NC 27834  
ph: 252-744-2201; email: [johnsoncyn@mail.ecu.edu](mailto:johnsoncyn@mail.ecu.edu)

Dear Dr. Johnson:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

## Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine

Ralph I. Horwitz, M.D., Dean  
10900 Euclid Ave, BRB 113  
Cleveland, OH 44106-4915  
ph: 216-368-2825; email: [rih1@po.cwru.edu](mailto:rih1@po.cwru.edu)

Dear Dr. Horwitz:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**University of Tennessee, Memphis, College of Medicine**

UT Health Science Center; 62 S. Dunlap, Suite 400

Memphis, TN 38163

ph: 901-448-5543; email: [hherrod@utmem.edu](mailto:hherrod@utmem.edu)

Dear University Dean:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**Texas A&M Health Science Center College of Medicine**

Christopher C. Colenda, M.D., M.P.H., Dean

159 Reynolds Medical Bldg.

College Station, TX 77843-1114

ph: 979-845-3431; email: [colenda@medicine.tamhsc.edu](mailto:colenda@medicine.tamhsc.edu)

Dear Dr. Colenda:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**University of Texas Medical School at San Antonio**

William L. Henrich, M.D., M.A.C.P., Dean  
7703 Floyd Curl Dr.  
San Antonio, TX 78229-3900  
ph: 210-567-4422; email: [henrich@uthscsa.edu](mailto:henrich@uthscsa.edu)

Dear Dr. Henrich:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

## Medical College of Wisconsin

Michael J. Dunn, Dean  
8701 Watertown Plank Rd.; Milwaukee, WI 53226  
ph: 414-456-8213; email: [mdunn@mcw.edu](mailto:mdunn@mcw.edu)

Dear Dean Dunn:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

## University of Wisconsin Medical School

Philip M. Farrell, M.D., Dean  
1300 University Ave.  
Madison, WI 53706  
ph: 608-263-4910; email: [pmfarrel@facstaff.wisc.edu](mailto:pmfarrel@facstaff.wisc.edu)

Dear Dr. Farrell:

I respectfully ask you to withdraw live animal labs from your physiology, pharmacology, and/or surgery curricula. Old-fashioned animal labs not only numb students to pain and suffering, but also dissuade them from learning about more applicable human-focused technologies.

Animals undergo invasive procedures, taxing behavioral drills, isolation and death, primarily to demonstrate redundant information with no bearing on human health. Indeed, Dr. Roger E. Ulrich states: "I discovered that experiments on animals offer only the illusion of control. By simplifying and segmenting the life of an organism, we create false data which, combined with the differences among species, make our efforts to apply the results to man, *useless*."

Two decades ago, medical schools enlisted dogs for the study of physiology, pharmacology, and surgery. Today, only Louisiana State University, New York Medical College and Medical College of Wisconsin feature dog labs. Of 125 medical schools accredited by the Association of American Medical Colleges, at least 100 no longer use *any* nonhuman species to train students.

Ethical unease and growing recognition of the inability to extrapolate data from animals to humans have prompted the discovery of sophisticated non-animal systems. Trauma training, for example, is now generally conducted with simulators that are less expensive than animal studies and crafted to emulate key facets of patient care.

Many facilities fulfill study criterion with in vitro cell and tissue culture analysis, epidemiology, videos and mathematical modeling, genetic and protein analysis, virtual organs and 3-D models, clinical research, human brain mapping technologies, autopsy/biopsy studies, advanced MRI imaging, and a multitude of other non-animal tools.

Animal experiments deflect focus and funding from cost-effective research that fosters knowledge pertinent to humans. Each species is so diverse in terms of its anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, and genetics that rodents or other animal models are unlikely to yield important results.

Case in point: The history of curing cancer in the mouse is a decades-old blunder that "simply didn't work in humans," according to Dr. Richard Klausner of the National Institute of Cancer. In fact, disease-induced lab rodents have miraculously walked away from paralyzing spinal cord injuries and triumphed over Alzheimer's when given an experimental vaccine thought to trigger this uniquely human affliction.

People, on the other hand, still suffer from spinal-cord injury, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, cancer, and other ailments analyzed in outmoded animal studies.

Over 80% of U.S. medical schools have already replaced animal experiments with human-applied teaching methods in undergraduate medical training. It is time for your university to join them. Thank you very much for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,