

HIGH PRIORITY QUESTIONS

For Monsanto

005254

1. Criticisms of our epidemiology studies.
2. Why was there a higher percentage of bladder cancers in the PAB workers who were also exposed to dioxin? Why higher lung cancer rates in those people exposed to dioxin?
3. Did you have any workers who did not develop chloracne after working in the 2,4,5-T department for three to six months?
4. Why doesn't Monsanto admit that people have died from dioxin exposure either in industrial accidents or at Yusho?
5. Since dioxin and benzene are carcinogens and you did have leukemia and a soft tissue sarcoma, how do you know these cancers are not work related?
6. In 1900, life expectancy was about 45 years. Today it is about 75 years. Do you believe that a healthier and safer work place and the products of industry have contributed to this longevity improvement?
7. How come the "TCP incident" employees were not included in the Zack/Gaffey study?
8. How come persons terminated before 1955 were not included in the Zack/Gaffey study? Those are the people with the highest exposures.
9. How come the Zack/Suskind study only included chloracne cases from the TCP incident? Why didn't the study include all the chloracne cases? Did Monsanto think that by having a small cohort, the study results would be negative?

CONFIDENTIAL

SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER.

QUESTIONS

10. There seems to be an excess of CHD in the exposed employees. Why was Monsanto trying to hide this fact? Why didn't Monsanto ever do anything to warn and compensate these employees?
11. Why did you allow your workers to have exposure to both dioxin and PAB when you knew they were both harmful to health and that the two materials acting together would make matters worse?
12. Since TCDD causes multiple tumor types in experimental animals at very low levels of exposure, why do you feel that it may not also cause cancer in the exposed Nitro workers?
13. Even if TCDD itself does not cause cancer in humans, due to its potent induction of enzyme systems which metabolize other cancer-causing chemicals, wouldn't the Nitro workers be at increased risk of developing cancer from one or more of these chemicals?
14. Why did you permit exposure to chlorine, H_2S , 2,4,5-T, and PAB that caused effects in workers and you didn't worry about synergistic action between these chemicals?
15. How many visits to the dispensary occurred each year due to Cl_2 exposures? Was each incident investigated? If so, where are these reports?
16. Since TCDD has been reported to cause toxic effects upon multiple organ systems, wouldn't it potentiate the toxic effects due to other toxic agents in the plant environment?
17. What role do Monsanto wastes play in the increased cancer rate in the Kanawha Valley?

QUESTIONS

HIGH PRIORITY QUESTIONS

For Burt Carnow

1. How often (what percent) would you expect to find "X" in the clinical patients in the medical clinics of the University of Illinois at Chicago?
2. If a man has a temperature of 98.7, is there a cause for worry? Why not? If it were 99.3 or if it were 100, would you worry?
3. How many permanent effects of dioxin exposure have been documented?

QUESTIONS

MEDIUM PRIORITY QUESTIONS

For Monsanto

1. After reading the literature on the Seveso disaster, why do you insist that no teratogenic effects are attributable to dioxin?
2. Why did Monsanto experience chronic chloracne problems throughout the production history, whereas other companies manufactured 2,4,5-T without such problems?
3. Do you believe that the industrial workplace is safer today than in the 1940's and 1950's? If so, what has caused it to become safer? Do you believe that health professionals, toxicologists, and other scientists in industry have contributed to the improvement?

QUESTIONS

LOW PRIORITY QUESTIONS

For Monsanto

1. Monsanto is fond of saying that the first industrial epidemiology on 2,3,7,8-TCDD was done on those workers exposed in 1949. Why didn't Monsanto do anything in response to this first study?

QUESTIONS

LOW PRIORITY QUESTIONS

For Burt Carnow

1. What usually happens to conclusions drawn from poorly done scientific work (Re: publication, acceptance by the scientific community, etc.)?