This letter relates to your request for public comments on the use of non-animal (in vitro cell culture) methods to study the toxic effects of chemicals from acute (short-term) exposure:

Charles Darwin said that “There is no fundamental difference between man and the higher animals in their mental faculties... The lower animals, like man, manifestly feel pleasure and pain, happiness and misery.” Torturing animals to prolong human life for the supposed purpose of making our society healthy and safer, I believe, has separated science from the most important thing that life has produced...the human conscience! And while at one point it was believed that the only way to test the toxic effect of chemicals, without doing harm to humans, was by using animals. There now exists numerous non-animal ways to accomplish the same end. And the sooner you adopt these tests (which are already as good as the use of live animals), the better these tests will get with time. Here lies the opportunity to set a new standard for chemical toxicity testing that helps humans without maming animals. And once this precedent is set, more money will flow to such alternatives, which will mean even better tests in the future. The NIEHS should adopt the new non-animal test methods IMMEDIATELY. The non-animal test methods have been considered for almost 20 years, and animals should not continue to suffer and die because of bureaucratic inertia.

While I am happy to hear that the NIEHS recommends using the non-animal method to set the starting dose for further animal- poisoning tests, it does not go far enough. Government agencies should use in vitro cell culture tests to completely replace the use of animals in lethal dose tests. At a minimum, all government agencies that currently require the acute animal-poisoning studies should immediately incorporate the in vitro cell culture method as a transitional means of reducing the number of animals killed and should fully support the use of this method as an eventual replacement for lethal-dose poisoning studies. In particular, the EPA must immediately incorporate the non-animal cell culture method into its HPV chemical program, as promised in **its October 1999 agreement with the animal protection community**.

I believe I am not interested to know whether vivisection produces results that are profitable to the human race or doesn't. To know that the results are profitable to the race would not remove my hostility to it. The pain which it inflicts upon un-consenting animals is the basis of my enmity toward it, and it is to me sufficient justification of the enmity without looking further. Mark Twain said this 100 years ago. And today the same vivisection continues. The science is there to move on to much more ethical tests that are not injurious to other beings. Please, lets not wait another 100 years to make this change.

Sincerely,

Ariel Thomas Nessel