



September 24, 2014

John Replogle, President and CEO
Seventh Generation
60 Lake Street
Burlington, VT 05401

Dear Mr. Replogle,

I am writing to clarify the false and misleading statements your company has made to the public regarding Seventh Generation's interactions with PETA and your company's stance on chemical testing reform.

First, please remember that we tried for a number of years to work with your company on this issue, repeatedly asking to meet in 2011 to no avail. When you did agree to meet, in December 2013, scientists from PETA and the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM) spoke to you and your Manager of Mission Advocacy and Outreach by phone regarding our concerns that Seventh Generation was supporting chemical testing reform that would lead to tens of millions of animals being poisoned in new chemical tests. At that time, you declined to address our concerns and told us very clearly that Seventh Generation is not involved in "the policy arena," a puzzling and blatantly false statement given the fact that Seventh Generation has lobbied for years on chemical testing reform.

On July 18, I wrote to you that given Seventh Generation's unwavering support of legislation that will lead to more animal testing—even as your company marketed cruelty-free products—PETA had no choice but to let our supporters know of this contradiction with a notation in our cruelty-free guide. As we informed you, we believed that the millions of consumers who rely on our guide specifically to support and patronize companies that oppose all tests on animals should know that Seventh Generation does not oppose animal tests in some situations. On July 29, your staff responded and again declined to address these important issues in any meaningful manner.

Since then, Seventh Generation has made a number of contradictory and false statements on its website and on social media. Your company representatives have stated, for example, that "we do not believe any chemicals need to be tested on animals, ever" and that "animal testing has no place in a civilized world," yet the company has also stated that animals may need to be used until "viable alternatives" are "ready" and that it does not support "unnecessary" chemical testing on animals—implying that the company believes some animal testing is necessary.

As you know, we have now shared our concerns about Seventh Generation's advocacy with our supporters, and your company is now claiming that it supports the use of animals in chemical testing only as "last resort." This sounds good, but

PEOPLE FOR
THE ETHICAL
TREATMENT
OF ANIMALS

Washington, D.C.
1536 16th St. N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
202-483-PETA

Los Angeles
2154 W. Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90026
323-644-PETA

Norfolk
501 Front St.
Norfolk, VA 23510
757-622-PETA

Oakland
554 Grand Ave.
Oakland, CA 94610
510-763-PETA

Info@peta.org
PETA.org

Affiliates:

- PETA Asia
- PETA India
- PETA France
- PETA Australia
- PETA Germany
- PETA Netherlands
- PETA Foundation (U.K.)

you have refused to sign on to [PCRM's letter](#) calling for this very language to be included in chemical reform legislation. You have not provided any information on how you are supporting "last resort" language, nor have you updated your public lobbying priorities to include this language or explained how you plan to advocate for this language in the future. To further confuse matters, you have responded to concerned consumers that you would not sign the PCRM letter because you believe that the modern technologies known as Tox 21 "just aren't ready." But the PCRM letter does not mandate the use of Tox 21 technologies; it simply recommends them as an approach and goal for chemical testing.

Finally, Seventh Generation has stated that PETA does not support chemical reform. This claim is completely false and absurd given the fact that PETA scientists have been actively working for years—very successfully I might add—to update chemical testing requirements with more reliable, cutting-edge, nonanimal methods that improve the efficiency, speed, and prediction of toxicity for humans while cutting costs and reducing animal suffering.

There has never been greater urgency for chemical testing reform. According to [Senator Boxer](#), "it is expected to take at least seven years before even a tiny fraction of the chemicals of concern are reviewed. This could leave nearly a thousand chemicals of greatest concern unaddressed." The *only* way in which this massive backlog of chemicals can be tackled is with high-tech, high-throughput testing methods—*not* by using outdated, slow, cumbersome, and cruel animal tests that have not served to protect the public health or the environment to date, and that have in fact slowed and confused the process of assessing chemicals.

We urge Seventh Generation to stop its empty talk on this issue and outline the concrete steps it will take to support the inclusion of "last resort" language in any chemical reform legislation, and to refuse to promote legislation that would increase animal testing.

Sincerely,

Jessica Sandler
Director, Regulatory Testing Division