



**Remarks delivered Oct. 11, 2017 by Carey Gillam
before a joint hearing of the European Parliament
Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety
and the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development**

Good morning -

I am an investigative journalist, someone who has spent 30 years focusing on facts, pursuing truth. And having spent roughly 20 of those 30 years delving into the dealings of Monsanto I can confidently tell you that the story of the company's top selling chemical - glyphosate - is not one of truth, but one of DECEIT – carefully calculated and choreographed deceit.

There is overwhelming evidence of attempts to deceive, and to do so in ways that manipulate the press and manipulate policy makers like you.

In my reporting role I – along with colleagues at US Right to Know – have obtained thousands of documents from our US regulators as well as from US scientists who work at public universities and these documents show clearly the long history of deception when it comes to presentation of glyphosate matters. In addition to those documents, we have now the thousands of pages of internal Monsanto emails, memos and other documents that make it clear beyond any doubt the efforts by this company to manipulate policy makers and members of the public.

You just heard panelists talk about the science. I'm here to share with you what the documents show about deception.

We know from the documents that Monsanto has:

- ❖ Ghostwritten research papers that assert glyphosate safety for publication & regulatory review
- ❖ Provided alternative assessments for studies that indicate harm; convinced regulators to discount evidence of safety problems
- ❖ Developed a network of European & U.S. scientists to push glyphosate safety message to regulators and lawmakers while appearing to be independent of industry
- ❖ Utilized public relations teams to ghostwrite articles and blogs that are posted using names of scientists who appear to be independent
- ❖ Formed front groups that work to discredit journalists and scientists who publicize safety concerns
- ❖ Provided EPA “talking points” to use if questioned by press about IARC classification
- ❖ Successfully pushed EPA to remove top independent epidemiologist from EPA Scientific Advisory Panel
- ❖ Enlisted 3 EPA officials to block a 2015 Glyphosate Review by the U.S. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry that Monsanto said would likely agree with IARC

Exposing what the food industry *doesn't* want us to know

Let's just look at a few key examples: When the Environmental Protection Agency' Cancer Assessment Review Committee put together its report asserting the safety of glyphosate, it cited several key papers as informing its decision. One top one on the list was this one – Greim et al 2015. Internally you see what Monsanto's David Saltimiras said about that: He told colleagues that he “ghost wrote” that paper.

Another key example – the EPA's cancer review committee report cited Williams et al, 2000 – this is a very important work and has been cited well more than 300 times in the literature on glyphosate and relied on by regulators around the world. You see internally Monsanto scientist, William Heydens talks to colleagues saying the William study was written by Monsanto and the company would just have named authors just “edit and sign”.

Another example is a 2011 paper that countered concerns about glyphosate's reproductive effects. Documents show that Monsanto's Donna Farmer talked internally about drafting and doing a “cut and paste” for this paper that asserted there was no evidence linking glyphosate exposure to adverse reproductive or developmental problems. If you look through a draft of the paper you see she did significant work but ...When the paper is published references to Monsanto and to Donna Farmer have been removed as authors.

And another example - A REVIEW OF GLYPHOSATE carcinogenic potential published in 2016 : You can see that when the papers were published they disclosed that the authors were scientists hired by a firm that was paid by Monsanto but they took pains to declare that No Monsanto employees reviewed any of the manuscripts – but we know that in fact not only did Monsanto review, they wrote, drafted etc... this is only one of many emails discussing all the work they were doing on these papers – this email string continues on to list all the other things Monsanto is doing to alter/edit/write the papers. You see here Monsanto is suggesting who would be the author?

Here again you see Monsanto's own people describing what they do as ghost writing. Scientist Bill Heydens says it will look “powerful” if the author is someone like Kirkland, Greim, etc..

These are just a few examples of ghostwriting – Monsanto has sought to dismiss the concerns, they've said their own words have been taken out of context and that revelations are irrelevant to the question of glyphosate safety. Yet, the federal court judge in the United States who has seen all the evidence to date has expressed concerns – See here in this transcript from a recent hearing the judge says Monsanto has been “drafting reports for allegedly independent experts” and questions Monsanto as to how they can deem that irrelevant?

Another way in which Monsanto has manipulated regulators and the public is by establishing these networks of scientists around the world to support its agenda and its message about the safety of this chemical. Monsanto and/or the Monsanto-backed Glyphosate Task Force pays them and they lobby regulators, author papers, etc.. to push the message that the chemical is safe. There are many, with many different types of relationships demonstrated in the documents --

You can see here that David Kirkland is one such paid expert Monsanto has relied on. In 2012 Monsanto was very worried about genotoxicity question arising from glyphosate research.. When it engaged Kirkland, Monsanto needed someone to help counter concerns that were persisting through independent research about the genotoxicity of glyphosate. He was expensive, but his work has been valuable to Monsanto.

Indeed, the 2013 Kier & Kirkland paper was also cited by EPA in its safety decision on glyphosate as you saw in the prior slide.

We don't have time to go through all the examples of this, but I want to point out that there is evidence of much more ghostwriting than just in research -

- ❖ Drafts and/or outlines articles and “policy briefs” promoting product safety & Monsanto strategies, arranges for friendly scientists to publish under their names so they appear independent but actually Monsanto public relations teams write or at least draft the communications – this has happened over and over again.
- ❖ Edits, outlines presentations and communications for academic professors to deliver to regulators, lawmakers, other audiences - without mention of Monsanto involvement

Why all these secret dealings? It appears Monsanto fears the real independent science.– Monsanto itself said it feared the IARC review when it found out in 2014 such a review was coming. The company said internally it knew it had vulnerability in epidemiology, toxicology, genotox, etc... It even predicted glyphosate would warrant a possible or probable rating from IARC the documents show.

The documents show that Monsanto feared a US agency called the ATSDR, which was also looking at glyphosate in 2015 would agree with IARC. So Monsanto officials worked with some high-level EPA officials to get that ATSDR review blocked. It was supposed to happen in 2015. ATSDR now says it has been restarted but still we haven't seen anything. See this quote from Monsanto “ We're trying to do everything we can to keep from having a domestic IARC occur...”

You recall I mentioned earlier that another strategy used by Monsanto with regulators is to provide alternative assessments for studies that Indicate harm; to convince regulators to discount evidence of safety problems Let's just look at one key example.

This dates back to 1983 and the very, very important study that Monsanto had done on its behalf. This was then and remains a pivotal study for glyphosate. This study - “A Chronic Feeding Study of Glyphosate (Roundup Technical) in Mice.” – ran for two years from 1980 to 1982 and involved 400 mice that were administered three different doses of the weed killer or received no glyphosate at all for observation as a

control group. The study was conducted for Monsanto to submit to regulators. But unfortunately for Monsanto, some mice exposed to glyphosate developed tumors at statistically significant rates, while the control group, the mice that received no glyphosate, showed no tumors at all. A [February 1984 memo](#) written by an EPA toxicologist stated the findings definitively: “Review of the mouse oncogenicity study indicates that glyphosate is oncogenic, producing renal tubule adenomas, a rare tumor, in a dose-related manner.” Monsanto discounted the findings, arguing that the tumors were “unrelated to treatment” and showing false positives, and the company provided additional data to try to convince the EPA to discount the tumors. But EPA toxicology experts still were not buying it. A different EPA scientist wrote in [February 1985](#) that a QUOTE “prudent person would reject the Monsanto assumption that Glyphosate dosing has no effect on kidney tumor production,” ”**Glyphosate is suspect” this EPA scientist said.** “**Monsanto’s argument is unacceptable.**”

Eight members of the EPA’s toxicology branch were worried enough by the kidney tumors in mice that they signed a [consensus review](#) of glyphosate in March 1985 stating they were classifying glyphosate as a Category C oncogen, a substance “possibly carcinogenic to humans.”

That finding did not sit well with Monsanto, and the company mounted what turned out to be a multi-year campaign to change EPA’s mind about that study. They hired a pathologist, a scientist to change EPA’s mind and that pathologist reported back that he found an extra tumor, one in the control group of mice, which meant the other tumors weren’t likely glyphosate related. Still the EPA scientists disagreed. This went on and on and in February 1986 an EPA scientific advisory panel told the EPA the studies should be repeated to help bring clarity to the issue. The EPA asked Monsanto for a repeat of the mouse study but -- Monsanto refused to do it. That discussion then dragged on and on and in June of 1989, EPA officials conceded, stating that they would drop the requirement for a [repeated mouse study](#). By the time an EPA review committee met in June 1991 on glyphosate, the mouse study was so discounted that the group decided that there was a [“lack of convincing carcinogenicity evidence”](#) in relevant animal studies. Still , some EPA scientists refused to go along with that classification, refusing to sign the report.

Now this is just one study, as I said, but we know through the documents that Monsanto has done similar things with other research studies presented to regulators. it is a really good example of how Monsanto can arm twist and override EPA scientists in how they view science. Whenever results are unfavorable in the eyes of independent scientists, Monsanto has an explanation for why regulators should discount the results.

Indeed when the EPA convened a scientific advisory panel in December 2016 to look at glyphosate issues, several of the SAP members, expert independent scientist, told the EPA that it was not following its own guidelines for how to interpret scientific data on glyphosate.

One of the things we’ve found is that there are many university scientists who give their “expert” and “independent” opinions to regulators, lawmakers, students and consumers, without disclosing that they are secretly receiving funding from and collaborating with the food and agriculture industry **Often they are receiving specific directions on what to say**, from companies that have a stake in the outcome. We have emails where Monsanto or their representatives discussed editing or even writing papers and presentations

that were to be delivered by “independent” experts. Monsanto officials and their PR people discuss in documents we’ve obtained setting up organizations that can go after and attack journalists, scientists and others who raise questions or criticize their products. One group set up as a false front is called Academics Review, a site that publishes a host of pro-industry propaganda while attacking people who question the industry spin. Here’s a quote from an internal document discussing setting that up: A Monsanto executive says” *From my perspective the problem is one of expert engagement and that could be solved by paying experts to provide responses. The key will be keeping Monsanto in the background so as not to harm the credibility of the information.*” There are many of these spelled out in internal documents.

These tactics are not limited to the US; they cross continents and are seen in Europe as well. You’ll hear more about that in the next session, but it’s clear the documents show what has been happening with regulatory influence, false front organizations, etc. is also the case here. You’re likely familiar with this story, of the cut and paste your agencies have done with Monsanto’s glyphosate safety data.

We hear a lot these days about ‘fake news’ so I wanted to share this quote from one IARC scientist who sat on the glyphosate working group telling Monsanto “stop with the fake news”

These details that I have laid out for you are not in dispute. They are all documented. Monsanto says it has nothing to hide. And I’m sure Dr. Kirkland will tell you that all of this is being misconstrued... But ASK yourself these questions --- Why would Monsanto need to ghostwrite research papers, set up networks of scientists to promote glyphosate safety? why would it be worried about a review by IARC and by ATSDR? These are not the actions of a company that has nothing to hide. This is **not** how you promote a product that is actually proven safe. This is how you whitewash unfortunate and unprofitable facts. Monsanto needs you to believe glyphosate is safe. Monsanto makes billions of dollars a year off glyphosate and glyphosate-tolerant seeds. Indeed, without glyphosate, there would be little value in its GMO glyphosate-tolerant crops. Monsanto has done an excellent job of this whitewash.

Your European Health Commissioner says that he wants to base his decisions **on science** and not political opinions. Well, **Actual independent** scientists conducting or reviewing **independent** research have found multiple reasons for concern with glyphosate. Yet regulators have mostly ignored independent research in favor of Monsanto’s own studies. And most importantly – regulators have allowed Monsanto to guide them on how to interpret the science. This is not by accident, but by design. It serves Monsanto very well, but it does not serve the public interest.