

Message

From: PAVELY, CHLOE [Redacted]
Sent: 9/25/2012 8:03:11 PM
To: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [Redacted] SACHS, ERIC S
[Redacted] HAMMOND, BRUCE G [Redacted]
[Redacted] GOLDSTEIN, DANIEL A [Redacted]
[Redacted]
CC: VICINI, JOHN L [Redacted] LEMKE, SHAWNA LIN
[Redacted] HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [Redacted]
[Redacted]
Subject: RE: Seralini

Also meant to include this!

Henry Miller and Bruce Chassy just published an article on Forbes.com, "Scientists Smell A Rat in Fraudulent Genetic Engineering Study."

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/henrymiller/2012/09/25/scientists-smell-a-rat-in-fraudulent-genetic-engineering-study/>

From the last page...

An obvious question is why Seralini would publish such obviously shoddy studies. The answer may be that negative headline stories laden with color pictures of rats with grotesque tumors are not easily forgotten even if the studies are fraudulent. Also, it may be hard for the non-expert to ignore the reported differences between control and experimental groups, and many non-experts will probably believe that where there is smoke, there is fire even if there are flaws in the experiment. But scientists understand that if the design, execution, or analysis of a study is fundamentally flawed, any conclusions are disqualified.

There is no question that the publication of Seralini's latest attack on genetically engineered foods was a well-planned and cleverly orchestrated media event. The study was designed to produce exactly the false result that was observed and was deliberately allowed to continue until large, grotesque tumors developed. The conduct of the study, including the treatment of the animals, raises serious ethical concerns and questions of scientific misconduct.

In the past Seralini and other anti-genetic engineering activists have played the media like a fiddle, but this time even journalists usually willing to trade accuracy and integrity for an "if it bleeds, it leads" story were skeptical of Seralini's claims. Maybe we have reached a turning point where the media will finally realize that they have been manipulated for years by expert professional con-men.

Not only was there never any plausible scientific reason to believe that genetically engineered crops posed risks any different from other crops, but hundreds of risk-assessment experiments and the vast cultivation and consumption of them during the past 17 years provide a high level of confidence about their safety and usefulness.

From: PAVELY, CHLOE [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2012 2:56 PM
To: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [Redacted] SACHS, ERIC S [Redacted] HAMMOND, BRUCE G [Redacted] GOLDSTEIN, DANIEL A [Redacted]

Cc: VICINI, JOHN L [Redacted] LEMKE, SHAWNA LIN [Redacted] HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Seralini

All,

Here are a few more references that might be useful.

Regards,

Chloe

1) EFSA positive opinions on NK603

Key message: over the course of the past 8 years, the EFSA Panel has consistently concluded that, based on the evidence provided, NK603 maize is as safe as conventional maize and therefore the placing on the market of NK603 maize for food or feed or processing is unlikely to have an adverse effect on human or animal health or, in that context, on the environment.

Opinion of the Scientific Panel on genetically modified organisms [GMO] on a request from the Commission related to the safety of foods and food ingredients derived from herbicide-tolerant genetically modified maize NK603, for which a request for placing on the market was submitted under Article 4 of the Novel Food Regulation (EC) No 258/97 by Monsanto1

Scientific Opinion of the GMO Panel - Published: 1 March 2004

Opinion of the Scientific Panel on genetically modified organisms [GMO] on a request from the Commission related to the Notification (Reference CE/ES/00/01) for the placing on the market of herbicide-tolerant genetically modified maize NK603, for import and processing, under Part C of Directive 2001/18/EC from Monsanto1."

Scientific Opinion of the GMO Panel - Published: 1 March 2007

Applications (references EFSA-GMO-NL-2005-22, EFSA-GMO-RX-NK603) for the placing on the market of the genetically modified glyphosate tolerant maize NK603 for cultivation, food and feed uses, import and processing and for renewal of the authorisation of maize NK603 as existing products, both under Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 from Monsanto[1]

Scientific Opinion of the GMO Panel - Published: 11 June 2009

Plus keep in mind that there are also EFSA positive opinions for various NK603 stacks, namely:

- MON89034 x NK603 x TC1507,
- MON 89034 x NK603,
- 59122 x TC1507 x NK603,
- 59122 x NK603,
- TC1507 x NK603,
- NK603 x MON810,
- MON863 x MON810 x NK603,
- MON863 x NK603.

2) EFSA to issue statement on Seralini new publication

<http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/press/news/120919b.htm>

Key message: EFSA is aware of the new Seralini publication and EFSA will consider the paper's relevance taking into account the available scientific evidence including recent studies assessing, over a sustained period of time, the potential toxicity of foods derived from GM crops.

3) AFIS' (French Agency for Scientific Information) reaction to the new Seralini publication.

In my experience, this is a really good website to share with our French-speaking general public. The philosophy of AFIS is to defend science (as opposed to "pseudo-science"). They cover all topics (GMOs, nuclear, homeopathy, paranormal

phenomenon etc.) but only chose to react when they feel the science shared with the public is misleading. They have already reacted to the new publication by Seralini by publishing 2 articles on their website!

Science as an excuse for a political-media show (in French)

<http://www.pseudo-sciences.org/spip.php?article1932>

The collateral damage of a «shocking study” on GMOs that will fall apart (in French).

<http://www.pseudo-sciences.org/spip.php?article1934>

This article also gives links to experts’ responses, some in English and some in French.

Key message: the technical arguments exposed in the Seralini paper are clearly methodologically biased thereby making the study not valid. The intention of the authors of this study is a political coup to make a lot of noise and damage that will take time to repair. The publication of the study was very carefully timed and contained (only shared with journalists under a confidentiality agreement) to avoid any pre-reactions by the scientific community. The scientific community rejects instrumentalization of science to an ideological end.

From: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [Redacted]

Sent: Monday, September 24, 2012 6:02 PM

To: SACHS, ERIC S [Redacted] HAMMOND, BRUCE G [Redacted] GOLDSTEIN, DANIEL A [Redacted]

Cc: VICINI, JOHN L [Redacted] LEMKE, SHAWNA LIN [Redacted] HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [Redacted] PAVELY, CHLOE

[Redacted]

Subject: RE: Seralini

Bruce,

As discussed for [Redacted] WHO/FAO JMPR references, (1) Summary Report and (2) Toxicological Evaluations “no evidence of carcinogenicity” (review of three full toxicology data sets from Syngenta, Cheminova and Monsanto). Also (3) US EPA’s classification as “Group E carcinogen (signifies evidence of non-carcinogenicity in humans)” and (4) EU Commission “no evidence of carcinogenicity” (4)

1. WHO/FAO. (2004) Pesticides residues in food -- 2004. Report of the Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and the WHO Core Assessment Group on Pesticide Residues (JMPR). Rome, Italy, 20–29 September 2004. FAO Plant Production And Protection Paper 178. World Health Organization and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Rome, Italy.

http://www.fao.org/ag/agp/agpp/Pesticid/JMPR/DOWNLOAD/2004_rep/report2004jmpr.pdf

2. WHO/FAO. (2004) Pesticides residues in food -- 2004. Report of the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues. Part II Toxicological Evaluations.

http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2006/9241665203_eng.pdf

3. U.S. EPA. (1993) Reregistration Eligibility Decision (RED) for Glyphosate. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Pesticide Programs. EPA 738-R-93-014.

http://www.epa.gov/oppsrrd1/REDs/old_reds/glyphosate.pdf

4. European Commission. (2002) Report for the Active Substance Glyphosate, Directive 6511/VI/99, January 21. http://ec.europa.eu/food/fs/sfp/ph_ps/pro/eva/existing/list1_glyphosate_en.pdf

David Saltmiras, Ph.D., D.A.B.T.

Toxicology Manager

Regulatory Product Safety Center

Monsanto

ph **Redacted**

From: SACHS, ERIC S **Redacted**

Sent: Monday, September 24, 2012 3:25 PM

To: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A **Redacted** HAMMOND, BRUCE G **Redacted** GOLDSTEIN, DANIEL A **Redacted**

Cc: VICINI, JOHN L **Redacted** LEMKE, SHAWNA LIN **Redacted** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F **Redacted** PAVELY, CHLOE **Redacted**

Subject: RE: Seralini

David, Bruce and Dan,

Last week I provided [Redacted] preliminary information and today the link to Monsanto's updated analysis of the Seralini paper. [Redacted] will be contributing information to "high bodies of the French government" on Friday (9/28). Here is some background information on [Redacted]

Our managing director, [Redacted] began as a molecular biologist at Lesaffre in the early 80s. Subsequently he became the Director of Life Sciences in the Group Danone, then the Director of Business Development at the Pasteur Institute. Since 2007 he is the CBO of Agcombiotech. In 2010 he joined the [Redacted]

[Redacted]

In his message below, he would like some affirmative data (publications), published Monsanto data, and other sources to validate the human health and safety of GM crops (especially NK603) and glyphosate. I know that there is a wealth of information so I recommend that you put yourself in his shoes and share with him credible and persuasive materials.

Please go ahead and share information directly with him and copy me.

Thanks,
Eric

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2012 2:00 PM
To: SACHS, ERIC S [Redacted]
Cc: STARK, DAVID M STL [Redacted] [Redacted]
Subject: Re: Seralini

Dear Éric,

Thank you for the link, useful but I need more information because even if you are right in your comments on how the experiment set up is weak it is not enough to convince governmental bodies, they will need more information about the toxicity test and the experiment that have been done by or for Monsanto. I will have to bring experimental data. In these kinds of dispute it is not enough just to be factual with the publication as the public opinion will think that Monsanto has not scientific data to show, thus that give more credit to Seralini stuff. You have certainly studies on long term use of GM crop in animal feeding. I do remember that bt corn has less mycotoxin and regarding the effect of mycotoxins on these kind of rats it is of interest.

Best regards

Redacted

Envoyé de mon iPhone

Le 24 sept. 2012 à 20:04, "SACHS, ERIC S **Redacted**" <eric.s.sachs@**Redacted**> a écrit :

Dear **Redacted**

You can access Monsanto's analysis and comments on the Seralini et al. paper at:
<http://monsantoblog.com/2012/09/21/monsanto-responds-to-french-rat-study/>.

Eric

Eric S. Sachs, Ph.D.

Science & Policy Lead, Regulatory

Monsanto Company

800 N. Lindbergh Blvd.

St. Louis, MO 63167

Desk: **Redacted**

Mobile: **Redacted**

Eric.S.Sachs@**Redacted**

From: STARK, DAVID M STL **Redacted**

Sent: Monday, September 24, 2012 10:50 AM

To: **Redacted** SACHS, ERIC S **Redacted**

Subject: RE: Seralini

Dear **Redacted**

I know that Eric (copied in) is working to get you information. I've also copied in **Redacted**, our head of corporate affairs for Europe, Africa and Middle East. **Redacted** is a friend going back to his days at Danone. He is now at **Redacted** and in charge of biotechnology. Please, let's make sure he has all the information he needs in advance of his meeting Friday.

Thank you,

David

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2012 6:33 AM
To: STARK, DAVID M STL [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Seralini

Dear David,

I will have to make a contribution for a very important meeting planned to be held next Friday with governmental bodies at very high level.

It will be very useful for me to have more information coming from Monsanto, I will not trace the source, we have to be very informative if not very bad decision could be taken.

Thank you for your help.

Best regards

[Redacted]

This e-mail message may contain privileged and/or confidential information, and is intended to be received only by persons entitled to receive such information. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately. Please delete it and all attachments from any servers, hard drives or any other media. Other use of this e-mail by you is strictly prohibited.

All e-mails and attachments sent and received are subject to monitoring, reading and archival by Monsanto, including its subsidiaries. The recipient of this e-mail is solely responsible for checking for the presence of "Viruses" or other "Malware". Monsanto, along with its subsidiaries, accepts no liability for any damage caused by any such code

transmitted by or accompanying
this e-mail or any attachment.

The information contained in this email may be subject to the export control laws and regulations of the United States, potentially including but not limited to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) and sanctions regulations issued by the U.S. Department of Treasury, Office of Foreign Asset Controls (OFAC). As a recipient of this information you are obligated to comply with all applicable U.S. export laws and regulations.