

Please be sure to include your full name and mailing or e-mail address in your letter, and send a copy of any response you receive to:

**Research & Investigations Department**

PETA  
501 Front St.  
Norfolk, VA 23510  
[Info@peta.org](mailto:Info@peta.org)

**Points You May Wish to Include in Letters to Environmental Defense**

- I was shocked to learn that Environmental Defense was largely responsible for initiating—and continues to actively support—the killing of large numbers of animals in the EPA's high production volume (HPV) chemical-testing program and is now seeking to do the same thing for the new field of nanotechnology. The field of nanotechnology is so new that animal tests are not yet required for toxicity testing. This new field should not be encumbered by unpredictable animal experiments that are not only cruel but also incapable of predicting the physiological effects of nanomaterials. Animal tests are imprecise, lack sensitivity, and are not relevant predictors of the effects of nanomaterials on humans.
- Poisoning animals in chemical toxicity tests is a useless, violent, and unethical practice.
- No animal test method in use today has ever been properly scientifically validated to determine its reliability and relevance to humans. Therefore, the results of animal tests are always subject to interpretation and manipulation, much to the detriment of human health and environmental protection.
- Despite killing hundreds of thousands of animals in cruel poisoning tests, the EPA has not banned a single toxic industrial chemical in more than a decade using its authority under the Toxic Substances Control Act. There is no excuse for poisoning animals to gather data that are clearly not being used to protect the environment or the safety of the public.
- It is appalling that an "environmental" organization would not only support massive animal-testing, but demand that companies conduct animal tests that are completely irrelevant to protecting humans. In its comments on industry-submitted test plans, Environmental Defense has repeatedly called for irrelevant, repetitive, and cruel tests to be conducted. For example, Environmental Defense requested that the American Chemistry Council (ACC) test the chemical warfare agent phosgene on another 675 animals. This substance, which killed thousands of infantrymen during World War I, is so highly reactive that it converts to hydrochloric acid upon contact with moisture deep in the lungs and burns the respiratory tract. Despite the fact that even the EPA agreed with the ACC that no more animals need die to further test this chemical, Environmental Defense asked for reproductive/developmental studies on this lethal substance!
- Environmental organizations should be lobbying to reduce human and environmental exposures to hazardous chemicals instead of demanding endless new animal tests.
- The goals of protecting the public and the environment from hazardous chemicals and protecting animals from suffering and death in laboratories are not mutually exclusive.
- Non-animal test methods are not only more humane, they are generally more rapid and economical, often producing results which are more reliable and relevant to humans than the results of tests on animals.
- Please confirm in writing that Environmental Defense will no longer support animal-testing so that I can once again feel confident in supporting your organization.