

December 7, 2015

Mr. Vytenis Andriukaitis  
Commissioner Health & Food  
Safety European Commission  
Rue de la Loi / Wetstraat 200  
1049 Brussels  
Belgium

Cc:

Mr. Phil Hogan, European Commissioner for Agriculture and Human Development  
Dr. Ladislav Miko, Deputy Director-General, DG Health & Food Safety  
Dr. Bernhard Url, Executive Director, EFSA  
Dr. Giovanni La Via, Chair, ENVI Committee EFSA Panel on Plant Protection Products and their Residues  
Mr. Christian Schmidt, Minister of Food and Agriculture  
Dr. Helmut Tschiersky, President of the Federal Office of Consumer Protection and Food Safety (BVL)  
Professor Dr. Dr. Andreas Hensel, President, BFR  
Dr. Christopher Wild, Director, International Agency for Research into Cancer (IARC)  
Professor Christopher J. Portier (Corresponding Author) on behalf of IARC Working Group  
Mr. Jim Jones, Assistant Administrator, USEPA  
Neil Anderson US EPA OPP Risk Management Branch for renewal of glyphosate: Branch Chief  
Tom Moriarty US EPA OPP Risk Management Branch for renewal of glyphosate: Team Leader

Dear Commissioner Andriukaitis,

**On December 3<sup>rd</sup> 2015 it was announced that Monsanto, the US-based transnational corporation, will be put on trial in the International Criminal Court in The Hague for ecocide<sup>1</sup>**

PARIS – The Organic Consumers Association (OCA), IFOAM International Organics, Navdanya, Regeneration International (RI), and Millions Against Monsanto, joined by dozens of global food, farming and environmental justice groups announced today that they will put Monsanto, a US-based transnational corporation, on trial for crimes against nature and humanity, and ecocide, in The Hague, Netherlands, next year on World Food Day, October 16, 2016. This International Criminal Court, established in 2002 in The Hague, has determined that prosecuting ecocide as a criminal offense is the only way to guarantee the rights of humans to a healthy environment and the right of nature to be protected.

The tribunal's website says, "*According to its critics, Monsanto is able to ignore the human and environmental damage caused by its products and maintain its devastating activities through a strategy of systemic concealment: by lobbying regulatory agencies and governments, by resorting to lying and corruption, by financing fraudulent scientific studies, by pressuring independent scientists, by manipulating the press and media, etc. The history of Monsanto would thereby constitute a textbook case of impunity, benefiting transnational corporations and their executives, whose activities contribute to climate and biosphere crises and threaten the safety of the planet.*"

In addition to Monsanto, the tribunal intends to mount a "best case" to denounce "all multinational companies which are driven by the profit motive and thereby threaten human health and the safety of the planet". The initiative is "*unique and unprecedented*", says Marie-Monique Robin.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.monsanto-tribunal.org/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://gmwatch.org/news/latest-news/16576-international-lawyers-and-ngos-launch-tribunal-to-try-monsanto-for-ecocide>

### **Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (December 10/11)**

We ask that this information be forwarded to the representatives of all EU member states before the next meeting of the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (December 10/11). To be discussed under Item 3 EFSA Conclusions: Glyphosate.<sup>3</sup>

This will join the Open letter signed by Prof Christopher J. Portier (the Corresponding Author).

### **Open letter: Review of the Carcinogenicity of Glyphosate by EFSA and BfR**

A group of over 90 independent scientists has written an open letter to the European Health and Food Safety Commissioner, Vytenis Andriukaitis, strongly challenging EFSA's decision and the BfR report that it was based on.<sup>4</sup>

They express deep concern that BfR assesses the widely used herbicide glyphosate as "unlikely to pose a carcinogenic hazard to humans".

They consider the BfR evidence point by point and the two most disturbing statements were that:

- BfR used historical controls (*When using historical control data, they should be from studies in the same timeframe, for the same exact animal strain, preferably from the same laboratory or the same supplier and preferably reviewed by the same pathologist*).
- The BfR Addendum dismisses the IARC Working Group finding that "*there is strong evidence that glyphosate causes genotoxicity*" by suggesting that unpublished evidence not seen by the IARC WG was overwhelmingly negative and that, since the studies that were reviewed were not done under guideline principles, they should get less weight. To maintain transparency, IARC reviews only publicly available data. Thus the use of confidential data submitted to the BfR makes it impossible for any scientist not associated with BfR to review this conclusion with scientific confidence. Further skewing their interpretation, the BfR did not include evidence of chromosomal damage from exposed humans that was highlighted in the IARC Monograph.

**This was what Anthony Samsel found in the secret sealed documents from the US EPA that showed that Monsanto knew glyphosate was carcinogenic but concealed the evidence by using historical documents and employing unpublished confidential industry data (often redacted).**<sup>5</sup>

Samsel and Seneff concluded that: "*significant evidence of tumours was found during these investigations*".

Extract: *Glyphosate has a large number of tumorigenic effects on biological systems, including direct damage to DNA in sensitive cells, disruption of glycine homeostasis, succinate dehydrogenase inhibition, chelation of manganese, modification to more carcinogenic molecules such as N-nitrosoglyphosate and glyoxylate, disruption of fructose metabolism, etc. Epidemiological evidence supports strong temporal correlations between glyphosate usage on crops and a multitude of cancers that are reaching epidemic proportions, including breast cancer, pancreatic cancer, kidney cancer, thyroid cancer, liver cancer, bladder cancer and myeloid leukaemia.*

**In 1991 the US EPA Health Effects Division colluded with Monsanto: glyphosate to be changed from a Group C carcinogen to Group E (evidence of non-carcinogenicity for humans)**<sup>6</sup>

Members of US EPA's Toxicology Branch of the Hazard Evaluation Division Committee, in a consensus review on March 4 1985, had classified glyphosate as a Group C carcinogen, based on the incidence in rats/mice of renal tumours, thyroid C-cell adenomas and carcinomas, pancreatic islet cell adenomas, hepatocellular adenomas and carcinomas in males, but on June 26 1991 the Health Effects Division Carcinogenicity Peer Review Committee met to discuss and evaluate the weight of evidence on glyphosate with particular emphasis to its carcinogenic potential. In a review of the data

<sup>3</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/standing\\_committees/sc\\_phytopharmaceuticals/docs/ag\\_2015121011\\_pppl\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/standing_committees/sc_phytopharmaceuticals/docs/ag_2015121011_pppl_en.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> <http://images.derstandard.at/2015/11/30/glyphosate.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> [https://www.academia.edu/17751562/Glyphosate\\_pathways\\_to\\_modern\\_diseases\\_IV\\_cancer\\_and\\_related\\_pathologies](https://www.academia.edu/17751562/Glyphosate_pathways_to_modern_diseases_IV_cancer_and_related_pathologies)

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.epa.gov/opp00001/chem\\_search/cleared\\_reviews/csr\\_PC-103601\\_30-Oct-91\\_265.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/opp00001/chem_search/cleared_reviews/csr_PC-103601_30-Oct-91_265.pdf)

the Committee concluded that glyphosate should be classified as Group E (evidence of non-carcinogenicity for humans). However, three of the Committee refused to sign and wrote: DO NOT CONCUR. In 2012 Séralini and his colleagues performed a 2-year rat feeding study on GMO Maize and Roundup® and found liver and kidney damage and similar tumours, but the UK Science Media Centre accused Séralini's team of fraud and said the paper should be withdrawn.

**The Wellcome Trust also colludes with industry: it hosts the UK Science Media Centre ---sponsored by corporations whose 'experts' denied that Roundup® and GMOS caused tumours**

The SMC sponsors include AstraZeneca, BP, Coca-Cola, L'Oreal, Monsanto, Syngenta and Nature Publishing Group. The Centre provides a rapid 'expert' opinion for journalists. But the Director admits that it was set up in the wake of Dr Árpád Pusztai publishing his paper which showed that rats fed on GM potatoes had stunted growth and a repressed immune system. The 'experts' are proponents of GMOs often having major conflicts of interest. The SMC allows corporations to influence what journalists write and hence control the information given to the British public.

**Séralini's team wins defamation and forgery cases on the team's GMO and pesticide research<sup>7</sup>**

On 25 November 2015, the High Court of Paris indicted Marc Fellous, former chairman of France's Biomolecular Engineering Commission, for "forgery" and "the use of forgery", in a libel trial that he lost to Prof Gilles-Eric Séralini. The Biomolecular Engineering Commission has authorised many GM crops for consumption.

In September 2012, an article written by Jean-Claude Jaillette in Marianne magazine said that "researchers around the world" had voiced "harsh words" about the research of Séralini and his team on the toxic effects of a GMO and Roundup over a long term period – research that was supported by the independent organisation CRIIGEN. The journalist wrote of a "scientific fraud in which the methodology served to reinforce pre-determined results".

Séralini, his team, and CRIIGEN challenged this allegation in a defamation lawsuit. They were assisted by the notaries Bernard Dartevelle and Cindy Gay. On 6 November 2015, after a criminal investigation lasting three years, the 17th Criminal Chamber of the High Court of Paris passed sentence. Marianne magazine and its journalist were fined for public defamation of a public official and public defamation of the researchers and of CRIIGEN, which is chaired by Dr Joel Spiroux de Vendômois.

**RMS GERMAN FEDERAL INSTITUTE OF RISK ASSESSMENT (BFR) CONCLUDED THAT GLYPHOSATE IS NOT HARMFUL TO THE ENVIRONMENT**

Here is a brief summary of the BfR Renewal Assessment Report evaluation of peer-reviewed literature regarding the ecotoxicity of Glyphosate.<sup>8</sup> It broadly concluded that glyphosate is not harmful to the environment.

Aquatic organisms: Summary page 64. "It was not possible to distinguish between the effects of the technical glyphosate and the surface active substance added to the commercial formulation."

Aquatic vertebrates: Summary page 68. "No report of statistical power of test glyphosate: most on commercial formulations."

Effects on amphibians: Summary page 95. "Does not resemble the lead formulation for EU assessment of renewal approval of glyphosate as an active substance."

Terrestrial arthropods including bees: Summary page 113 "Summary of relevant literature in 31 publications: none of the publications acceptable for risk assessment."

Effects on earthworms: Page 123. Twenty one publications submitted. Summary of relevant literature in earthworms: "Herbicide application did not directly affect movement or reproduction. The outcome of risk assessment did not change."

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.gmoseralini.org/seralinis-team-wins-defamation-and-forgery-court-cases-on-gmo-and-pesticide-research/>

<sup>8</sup> Glyphosate Renewal Assessment Report Vol 3 Annex B9. Evaluation of peer-reviewed literature regarding ecotoxicity

Effects on soil non-target micro-organisms; Page 143. “No negative effects at the moment, but should be included in future risk assessments.”

Other non-target: flora and fauna: 87 papers. See elsewhere. 2.6.7.2.

### **Science requires that measurements are made; even with glyphosate and the neonicotinoids**

The CRD, EFSA, US EPA and the AVPMA claim they are doing ‘*sound science*’. However, they are measuring many pesticides in groundwater **BUT NOT** glyphosate or the systemic neonicotinoids. These are the most widely used herbicides/pesticides in the world. Both glyphosate and neonicotinoid insecticides residues have been measured in humans and animals and in non-organic food, water, air and rain by independent scientists all over the world. Farmers are applying them blindly each year. The levels are increasing in the environment each year and can be correlated with losses of biodiversity.

### **Many independent sources have measured glyphosate in the environment**

In 2011, the US Geological Survey (USGS) published the first report on the ambient levels of glyphosate, the most widely used herbicide in the United States, and its major degradation product, aminomethylphosphonic acid (AMPA), in air and rain in Mississippi and Iowa in two growing seasons.<sup>9</sup> In 2013, scientists in Argentina did the same. “*Agricultural production is fundamentally based on a technological package that combines no-till and glyphosate in the cultivation of transgenic crops. Transgenic crops (soybean, maize and cotton) occupy 23 million hectares. This means that glyphosate is the most employed herbicide in the country, where 180–200 million liters are applied every year.*”<sup>10</sup> Another report from the USGS in 2014: “*The most comprehensive research to date on environmental glyphosate levels exposes the widespread contamination of soil and water in the US, as well as its water treatment system. Looking at a wide range of geographical locations, researchers from the US Geological Survey (USGS) analysed 3,732 water and sediment samples and 1,081 quality assurance samples collected between 2001 and 2010 from 38 states in the US and the district of Colombia. They found glyphosate in 39.4 % of samples (1,470 out of 3,732) and its metabolite aminomethylphosphonic acid (AMPA) in 55 % of samples. They concluded that Glyphosate and its degradation product AMPA occur frequently and widely in U.S. soils, surface water, groundwater, and precipitation.*”<sup>11</sup>

### **A biological desert: correlation of loss of biodiversity with glyphosate levels on an Iowa farm.**

The state of Iowa was just one area in which the USGS reported widespread contamination with glyphosate. Grundy County, Iowa was where Craig Childs spent a long weekend in a monoculture of GM “Roundup Ready” corn looking for wildlife.<sup>12</sup> “*In this cornfield, I had come to a different kind of planetary evolution. I listened and heard nothing, no bird no click of an insect ... Mr Owen was the farmer who had given us permission to backpack across his cornfields. He grew a combination of DuPont and Monsanto stock. We were in DuPont now. It didn’t look any different to me.*” In contrast, “*Yet, 100 years ago, these same fields, these prairies, were home to 300 species of plants, 60 mammals, 300 birds, hundreds and hundreds of insects. This soil was the richest, the loamiest in the state. And now, in these patches, there is almost literally nothing but one kind of living thing. We’ve erased everything else. There’s something strange about a farm that intentionally creates a biological desert to produce food for one species: us. It’s efficient, yes. But it’s so efficient that the ants are missing, the bees are missing, and even the birds stay away. Something’s not right here. Our cornfields are too quiet.*”<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21128261>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23849835>

<sup>11</sup> <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jawr.2014.50.issue-2/issuetoc>

<sup>12</sup> Childs, C. *Apocalyptic Planet. Field Guide to the Future of the Earth*, ch. 6, Species Vanish, p. 187. New York: Vintage Books (2013)

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.npr.org/blogs/krulwich/2012/11/29/166156242/cornstalks-everywhere-but-nothing-else-not-even-a-bee>

## **Birth defects in animals in Montana correlates with glyphosate usage on crops and with birth defects in humans**

A recent study by Hoy *et al.* found alarming increases in congenital malformations in wildlife in Montana that Hoy has been documenting for the past 19 years. Similar birth defects have occurred in humans in the USA. Their graphs illustrating human disease patterns over the twelve-year period correlate remarkably well with the rate of glyphosate usage on corn, soy and wheat crops, which has increased due to “Roundup Ready” crops. While the animals’ exposure to the herbicide is through food, water and air, the authors believe that human exposure is predominantly through food, as the majority of the population does not reside near agricultural fields and forests. They conclude: “*Our over-reliance on chemicals in agriculture is causing irreparable harm to all beings on this planet, including the planet herself. Most of these chemicals are known to cause illness, and they have likely been causing illnesses for many years. But until recently, the herbicides have never been sprayed directly on food crops, and never in this massive quantity. We must find another way*”.<sup>14</sup>

## **RAPORTEUR MEMBER STATE BFR CONCLUDED THAT GLYPHOSATE IS NOT HARMFUL TO HUMANS** **GM Watch Reports: Argentina: Public health crisis from pesticide spraying on GM crops worsens<sup>15</sup>** The GM crops that are causing the public health crisis in Argentina (see below) are going into animal feed for Europe’s livestock

Faculty of Medicine, University of Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires. October 17, 2015 Report of the 3rd NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PHYSICIANS IN THE CROP-SPRAYED TOWNS<sup>16</sup>

“Five years since the first meeting at the Faculty of Medical Sciences of Córdoba, scientists, doctors, and members of health teams for sprayed villages of Argentina, gathered in the Aula Magna of the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Buenos Aires (UBA), we verify that what we said then is dramatically true and getting worse by the day: the current system of agricultural production in the country pollutes the environment and Argentine food, sickening and killing human populations in agricultural areas.

In the last 25 years the consumption of pesticides increased by 983% (from 38 to 370 million kilos), while the cultivated area increased by 50% (from 20 million ha to 30 million ha). A production system based on the systematic application of agricultural poisons means, inevitably, that nature responds by adapting, forcing farmers to apply greater quantities of pesticides in the field to achieve the same objectives. Over the years a system has been created by and for sellers of pesticides, who every year increase their net sales (in 2015 the increase was 9%) while our patients, too, year after year are being exposed to this pesticide pollution more and more.

There is no doubt that the massive and growing exposure to pesticides changed the disease profile of Argentine rural populations and that cancer is the leading cause of death among them (and the worst way to die).

During 2015 the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC WHO) recognized the human carcinogenicity of several pesticides, including glyphosate. This is the most widely used pesticide in the world and Argentina consumed 240 million kilos in the last year generating a potential average exposure of 6 kilos per year, the highest in the world. Glyphosate is bought and stored anywhere and is applied without any restriction on schools, neighbourhoods, streets and villages, subjecting people to an unjust and unnecessary exposure.”

### **To defend the human right to life, a healthy life and a healthy environment we call for:**

- comprehensive ban on aerial spraying in the country with any kind of agrochemicals. The levels of pollution generated is unacceptable for the environment and human health

---

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.esciencecentral.org/journals/the-high-cost-of-pesticides-human-and-animal-diseases-2375-446X-1000132.php?aid=56471>

<sup>15</sup> <http://gmwatch.org/news/latest-news/16564-argentina-public-health-crisis-from-pesticide-spraying-on-gm-crops-worsens>

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.reduas.com.ar/declaration-of-the-3rd-national-congress-of-physicians-in-the-crop-sprayed-towns/>

- prohibit all pesticides IARC-WHO recognized as human carcinogens grades 1, 2A and 2B, especially glyphosate. There is no need to justify the risk of generating cancer in people exposed environmentally or through contaminated food
- while the near total ban on glyphosate term is reached, it is urgent to get a reclassification to red tag (currently green label) and immediately prevent its free commercialization and application in and near populated areas and schools
- prohibit all “highly hazardous pesticides”, according to WHO and FAO, many are already banned in their countries of origin but are marketed in ours
- prohibit any spraying around 1000 meters from villages and schools, the presence and movement of machines to spray (mosquitoes) in urban areas and the existence of deposits of pesticides within towns and neighbourhoods of cities
- generate public policies that discourage the use of poisons in farming and food production, recognizing the toxic nature thereof. It is necessary to put into question the current model of agroindustrial and transgenic production instead looking for systems that allow for social and cultural integration and defence and reproduction of ecological conditions of our environment. It is possible through state action to decrease the levels of use of pesticides in our country as demonstrated by experiences of other countries, promoting agro-ecology, local food consumption and defence of food security

#### **Responsibility of the European Commission (EC) and the EFSA Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (PAFF)**

BfR and EFSA claim that glyphosate does not affect human health or the environment. Cited above is just a fraction of the massive contrary evidence from independent scientists/physicians.

If the EC and the Standing Committee (PAFF) are mindful to re-approve glyphosate, they could be required to justify it in the International Criminal Court in The Hague on October 16 2016.

The European Commission should ban glyphosate immediately, with no exceptions, no derogations and no extensions to finish up stocks. In addition they should ban a neurotoxic compound, Monsanto’s aspartame, present in diet drinks. The UK was Rapporteur Member State (2013/14).

#### **Re-approval of aspartame by the UK Committee of the Toxicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment (COT) and the Foods Standards Agency (FSA); COT provides scientific advice to the UK Food Standards Agency**

CoT is described as an independent scientific committee, appointed by Ministers. Members are asked to state conflicts of interest. In 2011 there were two members from AstraZeneca and one from Syngenta (AstraZeneca is Syngenta’s parent company), yet none of them declared any conflict of interest. Professor Robert Smith appears as the Public Interest Representative. *“Rob Smith sees his role as a non-specialist member of COT as being here to represent consumers and to ask the sort of questions that are of interest to the general public.”* Far from being non-specialist, Professor Smith has been Defra’s Research programme adviser from 2004 to 2010 and has alternated between the ACP/COT as a specialist adviser in the environmental effects of pesticides since 1999, apart from a 3-year gap. The UK is the RMS for aspartame.<sup>17</sup> In December 2013 CoT re-approved Monsanto’s chemical sweetener aspartame.<sup>17</sup> As a result of unpublished British research (Hull University), CoT had decided there is no need to ban or control the sale or consumption of the sweetener, aspartame, to protect the health of the public. On December 10<sup>th</sup> 2013 EFSA completed *“full risk assessment on aspartame and concludes it is safe at current levels of exposure.”*<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.food.gov.uk/news-updates/news/2013/5894/aspartame>

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/press/news/131210.htm>

Prof Erik Millstone of Sussex University had written on multiple occasions to EFSA about the toxicity of aspartame, beginning in June 2011. He wrote a 67-page document on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2013<sup>19</sup> in response to the EFSA draft report: *“The draft report on the safety of aspartame, issued by the European Food Safety Authority’s ANS panel on 8 January 2013, is deeply flawed.”* He detailed the history of aspartame in the US and the fact that for 16 years it was considered too toxic to be licenced because it was neurotoxic and carcinogenic. On page 15 is an indictment<sup>20</sup> against GD Searle, the original owners, before Monsanto bought the company.

Ralph D Walton MD, Professor at the Center for Behavioural Medicine, North Eastern Ohio University College of Medicine has published a review of studies.<sup>21</sup> He did research for 60 minutes on scientific peer-reviewed studies and funding; 92 per cent of the studies showed problems with aspartame, but Walton said if you remove 6 studies because the FDA had something to do with it and their controversy, and 1 pro-industry summary, one hundred per cent of independent scientific peer-reviewed studies showed the toxicity of aspartame. Aspartame is an addictive, excitoneurotoxic, carcinogenic, genetically engineered drug and adjuvant that damages the mitochondria and interacts with drugs and vaccines.

### **THE AMERICAN BIRD CONSERVANCY PRODUCED A REPORT ON NEONICOTINOIDS AND BIRDS In the Report they correlated measurements of neonicotinoids with the effects on birds**

ABC had commissioned world-renowned environmental toxicologist Dr Pierre Mineau to conduct the research. Cynthia Palmer, co-author of the report is an environmental lawyer and Pesticides Program Manager for ABC. The authors called for a ban on the use of the neonicotinoid insecticides as seed treatments and for the suspension of all applications pending an independent review of the products' effects on birds, terrestrial and aquatic invertebrates, and other wildlife.

*Page 5: It looks as if the USEPA and other regulatory agencies consistently approved registrations despite their own scientists’ repeated and ever-growing concerns. It is relevant to ask why we conduct scientific evaluations of products if those evaluations have little or no bearing on the registration decisions that are made, and when staff scientists warning of ‘major risk concerns’ appear to be ignored.*

### **Poison Spring: The Secret History of Pollution and the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency)**

*“Poison Spring”<sup>22</sup> documents, in devastating detail, the corruption and misuse of science and public trust that has turned the (US) EPA from a watchdog into a “polluters’ protection agency.” In its half-century of existence, the agency has repeatedly reinforced the chemical-industrial complex by endorsing deadly chemicals, often against the continued advice of its own scientists. It has botched field investigations, turned a blind eye to toxic disasters, and unblinkingly swallowed the self-serving claims of industry.”...“Rarely has our government allowed and encouraged the actions of the chemical industry so openly as it did during Reagan’s tenure in Office. He opened the door wide to corporate influence throughout the government, and especially at the Environmental Protection Agency, which began a precipitous functional decline. Reagan gave corporations the reins of power at the agency and they immediately began tearing the EPA apart.”... “In my 25-year experience at the US EPA, nothing illustrated the deleterious nature of “pesticides” and “regulation” better than the plight of honeybees.<sup>23</sup> Here is a beneficial insect pollinating a third of America’s crops, especially fruits and vegetables, and we thank it with stupefying killing.*

---

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=em-letter-to-efsa-on-aspartame-20feb2013.pdf&site=25>

<sup>20</sup> In his role as FDA Chief Counsel, Richard Merrill was therefore satisfied that the FDA had gathered sufficient evidence for G D Searle to be indicted for: “...violations of the federal Food, Drugs and Cosmetics Act...and the False Reports to the Government Act...and for concealing material facts and making false statements in reports of animal studies conducted to establish the safety of...the food additive Aspartame.”

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.dorway.com/peerrev.html>

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.independentsciencenews.org/health/poison-spring-the-secret-history-of-pollution-and-the-epa/>

<sup>23</sup> [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/evaggelos-vallianatos/honeybees-on-the-verge-of\\_b\\_4326226.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/evaggelos-vallianatos/honeybees-on-the-verge-of_b_4326226.html)

*Poisoning of honeybees became routine in the mid-1970s with the EPA's approval of neurotoxins encapsulated in dust-size particles that took days to release their deadly gas. Some of my EPA colleagues denounced such misuse of science and public trust. They told their bosses those encapsulated neurotoxins were weapon-like biocides that should have no standing in agriculture and pest management. Indeed, one of those EPA ecologists discovered the neurotoxic plastic spheres in the honeybee queens' gut. This meant poison in the honey. EPA acted with fury. It forced the scientist out of his laboratory and into paper pushing in Washington. Approval of the industry's neurotoxins expanded to cover most major crops. This meant honeybees had less and less space to search for food without dying. The blowback of this almost criminal policy is the massive death of honeybees all over the country. Government officials and industry executives cooked up an obscure name, "colony collapse disorder," to cover up the pesticide killers of the honeybees."*

Extract on Fracking: "The upshot all this is that there are more than a thousand cases of fracking-related water contamination in 34 states, and documented cases of both human harm and severe health on wildlife and farm animals. In Colorado alone, where drilling increased by 50% between 2003 and 2008, there are more than 1,500 fracking spills." page 227.

One of the authors, E.G.Vallianatos, had worked for the US EPA for 25 years.

### **Failure to regulate data fraud comes home to roost** Carol Van Strum 9 April 2015

Extracts:<sup>24</sup> Within the first decade of the EPA's existence, it became obvious that nearly all the "safety" tests supporting pesticide registrations were faked, with either fraudulent or nonexistent data. The massive lab fraud uncovered at Industrial Bio-Test Laboratories (IBT) revealed that 99 percent of long-term studies (for cancer, birth defects, mutagenicity, reproductive damage etc.) supporting some 483 pesticide registrations were invalid. For 25 years, in what US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) officials called "*the most massive scientific fraud ever committed in the United States, and perhaps the world,*" all major chemical and pharmaceutical companies had paid IBT to produce the test data they needed to register their products. All but forgotten now, the IBT fraud shook the chemical and pharmaceutical industries and regulatory agencies around the world. In 1983, a six-month-long criminal trial resulted in the convictions of three IBT officials. The trial revealed a vast, lucrative business of deceptive safety testing:

- New animals routinely substituted - often *en masse* - for test animals that died, without noting deaths or substitutions in lab reports;
- Entire test data and lab reports for one test product copied into reports for other products;
- "Magic pencil" studies substituted false data for tests never done or results implicating test products' adverse or fatal effects;
- Signatures of lab techs who had refused to sign false reports were forged by managers on the false reports;
- Rats listed as dead and autopsied in one section of a report reappeared alive and breeding in another section of the same report ("Now IBT did some strange and unusual things," Dr. Adrian Gross, who first revealed the IBT scandal, remarked, "but bringing back the dead wasn't one of them.");
- Substitution of unexposed control animals for test animals that died;
- Substitution of dogs for rats when all the rats in one test died, then reporting them to be rats;
- Wholesale concealment and falsification of cancers, testicular atrophy, death and other effects in test animals;
- A laboratory that IBT scientists called "The Swamp," with a faulty water system that drenched the entire room, cages, rodents and all, in a continuous spray of water, drowning the test animals in droves. "Dead rats and mice, technicians later told federal investigators,

---

<sup>24</sup> <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/30097-failure-to-regulate-pesticide-data-fraud-comes-home-to-roost>



decomposed so rapidly in the Swamp that their bodies oozed through wire cage bottoms and lay in purple puddles on the dropping trays."

- Massive, frequent die-offs of test animals due to staff failing to feed and water them over holidays, rodents dying from unhygienic conditions, rats dying from rat poison fed them by mistake, rodents escaping, rats and mice being shifted from one cage to another, contaminating and eating each other; frequent "search and destroy" hunts for escaped rodents, with scientists and lab techs dashing about squirting chloroform to "slow down" the escapees, often killing the test animals as well;
- After Gross' first visit to IBT in 1976 and before he could return with auditors, the company equipped its offices with paper shredders and "strip filed" huge volumes of raw data, studies and client lists, including all of its studies on 2,4-D, six other herbicides (never identified), artificial sweeteners, cyclamates and plastics components.

### **US EPA Office of Pesticides Programs (OPP) Workshop: 'Streamline the Risk Assessment Process of Pesticides Registration' No mention of human health or the environment<sup>25</sup>**

On December 13th 2010 the EPA OPP ran a Workgroup to 'Streamline the Risk Assessment Process of Pesticides Registration.' Robert Schultz won the OPP competition by designing an e-dossier to make it easier and faster for the registrants. The benefits were said to be "*reduced costs to the EPA associated with primary reviews and quicker processing.*" There were 67 (updated to 77) slides without a mention of either human health or the environment. Slide 35 showed that: "since 2002 no pesticide products had been suspended by the EPA." This record has just been broken. Sustainable Pulse reported on 25/11/2015:<sup>26</sup> "*The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), responding to litigation,<sup>27</sup> has announced it is revoking the registration of "Enlist Duo." Approved by the agency just over a year ago, Enlist Duo is a toxic combination of glyphosate and 2,4-D that Dow AgroSciences created for use on the next generation of genetically engineered crops, designed to withstand being drenched with this potent herbicide cocktail.*"

### **US EPA gives 'conditional' registration to pesticide products; industry is allowed to market them with data gaps. Conditional registration<sup>28</sup> of clothianidin in the US**

On May 30, 2003, Daniel C Kenny of the US EPA Registration Division granted conditional registration for clothianidin to be used for seed treatment on corn and canola (oil seed rape) to Bayer Corporation.<sup>29</sup> In the 19-page document, the EPA scientists (as opposed to the Registration Division) had assessed the risks as: "*Clothianidin is highly toxic to honey bees on an acute contact basis. It has the potential for toxic chronic exposure to honey bees, as well as other non-target pollinators, through the translocation of clothianidin residues in nectar and pollen. In honey bees, the effects of this toxic chronic exposure may include lethal and/or sub-lethal effects in the larvae and reproductive effects in the queen. The fate and disposition of clothianidin in the environment suggest a compound that is a systemic insecticide that is persistent and mobile, stable to hydrolysis, and has potential to leach into ground water, as well as run-off to surface waters. There is evidence of effects on the rat immune system and juvenile rats appear to be more susceptible to these effects.*"

Summary of Data Gaps. Page 18. There were gaps in Toxicology; Residue Chemistry; Environmental Fate Data and Ecological Effects Data. These included: Additional studies on *Developmental Immunotoxicity and Mutagenicity. Data on aerobic aquatic metabolism and a Seed leaching study. Whole sediment acute toxicity to freshwater invertebrates. Field test for pollinators.* There is no evidence that the data gaps were filled in. This is confirmed by the following Memo.

<sup>25</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/ppdc/pria/2010/december/update-presenta.pdf>

<sup>26</sup> <http://sustainablepulse.com/2015/11/25/us-epa-revokes-herbicide-registration-for-new-generation-of-gm-crops/#.VmVngLfhDcs>

<sup>27</sup> <http://www.panna.org/sites/default/files/2015-11-24%20EPA%20Voluntary%20Vacatur.pdf>

<sup>28</sup> 'Conditional' means that they are allowed to sell it on condition that they fulfil all the data gaps within a year

<sup>29</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/opprd001/factsheets/clothianidin.pdf>

## **A Memo in 2010 from a US EPA Ecologist to the Environmental Risk Branch of Registration Division warning of the devastating effects of clothianidin on biodiversity, including honey bees<sup>30</sup>**

Here are extracts from the 101-page document: “The potential for *clothianidin* to move to move from the treated area to the nearby surface water body has been increased significantly since 2003 because the registrant has recently added new uses to the labels. The compound is toxic to honey bees... The persistence of residues and potential residual toxicity of *clothianidin* in nectar and pollen suggests the possibility of chronic toxic risk to honey bee larvae and the eventual instability of the hive... *clothianidin* has the properties of a chemical which could lead to widespread groundwater contamination, but no groundwater studies have been conducted to date...extreme mobility and persistence of *clothianidin* in the environment.” The ecologist disappeared from his desk.

## **Corporate Lobbyists in Europe**

Corporate Europe Observatory (CEO) is a research and campaign group working to expose and challenge the privileged access and influence enjoyed by corporations and their lobby groups in EU policy making.<sup>31</sup> CEO in May 2015: *Brussels nowadays is the second capital of corporate lobbying in the world – after Washington DC. An estimated 20-30.000 lobbyists populate the EU quarter, the large majority of whom represents corporations. All big corporations have their own lobby offices and in-house lobbyists.*<sup>32</sup>

As the recent scandal on Volkswagen car emissions has shown, the European Commission is very influenced by numbers of lobbyists. CEO wrote in September 2015. *In terms of personnel, Volkswagen is also miles ahead of its competitors – Daimler has 14 staff lobbying in the Belgian capital while BMW has 8. VW has 43, almost double both combined. The highest non-German manufacturer is Honda, with 10 lobbyists.*<sup>33</sup>

CEO wrote in October 2015: *It is certainly not true that there have been no concerned voices over the testing regime, even well before the VW scandal.*<sup>34</sup> *The concerns over European testing procedures have been voiced by many for years now, for instance in a [Dutch report](#) from 2013. And as for the debate over fuel efficiency and emissions – that goes back decades. Perhaps the Commission has not listened carefully to other voices than industry?*

## **We are drowning our world in unsafe and untested chemicals<sup>35</sup>**

By Gabrielle Canon 01/10/2015

The International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO), a group representing OB-GYNs from 125 countries, released a report detailing the detrimental health effects caused by even small exposure to common chemicals like the ones found in pesticides, plastics, and air pollution.<sup>36</sup> The health problems are even greater for babies exposed in the womb, who face increased risks of cancer, reduced cognitive function, and even miscarriage or stillbirth. The organization cited concerns about the sharp increase over the past four decades in chemical manufacturing, which continues to grow by more than 3 per cent every year. Some 30,000 pounds of chemicals were manufactured or imported for every person in the United States in 2012 alone—a whopping 9.5 trillion pounds in total. Annually, the FIGO authors write, chemical manufacturing leads to 7 million deaths and billions in health care costs.

In an article in the UK about why we should eat organic food,<sup>37</sup> the journalist said that in 31,000 tonnes of chemical are used in farming in the UK each year.

<sup>30</sup> [http://www.panna.org/sites/default/files/Memo\\_Nov2010\\_Clothianidin.pdf](http://www.panna.org/sites/default/files/Memo_Nov2010_Clothianidin.pdf)

<sup>31</sup> <http://corporateeurope.org/about-ceo>

<sup>32</sup> <http://corporateeurope.org/food-and-agriculture/2015/05/toxic-affair-how-chemical-lobby-blocked-action-hormone-disrupting>

<sup>33</sup> <http://corporateeurope.org/power-lobbies/2015/09/power-car-industry-lobby-makes-scandal-inevitable>

<sup>34</sup> <http://corporateeurope.org/international-trade/2015/10/vw-tested-once-approved-everywhere>

<sup>35</sup> <http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2015/10/human-reproduction-threatened-pollution>

<sup>36</sup> [http://www.figo.org/sites/default/files/uploads/News/Final%20PDF\\_8462.pdf](http://www.figo.org/sites/default/files/uploads/News/Final%20PDF_8462.pdf)

<sup>37</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/oct/07/why-should-i-eat-organic-google>

### **Will the global élite survive the contamination of the environment with pesticides?**

The global élite may be able to survive by eating organic food, but not the pollution of water, soil and air by genotoxic and teratogenic herbicides and insecticides. The agrochemical industry has created a toxic environment from which none can escape. The devastating effects of these silent killers in our water do not distinguish between farmers or city dwellers, the wealthy or the poor, between media Moghuls or their reporters, Monsanto Executives, Presidents, or Prime Ministers. The recent episodes of extreme weather and severe flooding caused by climate change merely spreads the chemicals further. But the public has no idea.

### **THE OPEN LETTER FROM AMERICA WARNING THE UK AND THE EU AGAINST AUTHORIZING GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS<sup>38</sup>**

The Open Letter from America was from 60 million American citizens to David Cameron (and the EU) warning the UK not to authorize GM crops because of the devastating effects on human health and the environment.

US Citizens tell us the truth about GM crops: it is about corporate control of the food system.

***“Through our experience we have come to understand that the genetic engineering of food has never really been about public good, or feeding the hungry, or supporting our farmers. Nor is it about consumer choice. Instead it is about private, corporate control of the food system.***

***Americans are reaping the detrimental impacts of this risky and unproven agricultural technology. EU countries should take note: there are no benefits from GM crops great enough to offset these impacts. Officials who continue to ignore this fact are guilty of a gross dereliction of duty.”***

Another Report from the US tells us an identical story of corporate control.

### **Excerpt from 2012 US Report on Children’s Health: A Generation in Jeopardy<sup>39</sup>**

A Generation in Jeopardy: How pesticides are undermining our children’s health & intelligence

*“This report draws from academic and government research, focusing on studies published within the past five years, to chronicle the emerging threat of – with over 1 billion pounds applied on farms and homes annually– to children’s health....Our current system of industrial agriculture and pest control relies on chemical inputs sold by a handful of corporations. These multinational corporations wield tremendous control over the system, from setting research agendas to financing, crop selection and inputs throughout the production and distribution chain. Not surprisingly, these same corporations also hold significant sway in the policy arena, investing millions of dollars every year to influence voters, lawmakers and regulators at both the state and federal level to protect the market for pesticides. The result is agriculture, food and pest control systems that serve the interests of these corporations well. It does not, however, serve farmers, who have lost day-to-day control of their operations and are putting themselves and their families in harm’s way.”*

Rosemary Mason

07/12/2015

---

<sup>38</sup> [www.theletterfromamerica.org](http://www.theletterfromamerica.org)

<sup>39</sup> <http://www.panna.org/publication/generation-in-jeopardy>