

FAX COVER SHEET

To:

Paul Merrell & Carol Van Strum
Bradley & Merrell

From:

Peter Montague
Environmental Research Foundation
(410) 263-1584 (voice)
(410) 263-8944 (fax)

4 pages (including this cover sheet)

Sent on 13-Nov-93 at 16:14

Sent via FaxWorks OS/2



November 13, 1993

Hi, Paul--

It has occurred to me that an important aspect of this case may be showing a jury reasons why Monsanto might have been interested, in 1979, in conducting studies that were foreordained to show no harm from exposure to 2,4,5-T and dioxin.

The attached news story shows the tip of the iceberg: \$50 BILLION in lawsuits pending against Monsanto.

There were also, of course, Nitro workers suits, the Sturgeon citizens, the Sturgeon clean-up railway workers, and probably others who were suing Monsanto in 1979-1980 or whom Monsanto knew had been exposed to dioxin and therefore might sue.

It would be good to get Monsanto to tell us the total number of lawsuits that were filed against them during this period (say, 1978 through 1983) and the total amount of liability they believed they faced.



LEVEL 1 - 976 OF 1020 STORIES

The Associated Press

The materials in the AP file were compiled by The Associated Press. These materials may not be republished without the express written consent of The Associated Press.

July 25, 1980, Friday, AM cycle

SECTION: Domestic News

LENGTH: 431 words

HEADLINE: Additional \$960 Million Sought From Agent Orange Manufacturers

BYLINE: By JANET McCONNAUGHEY, Associated Press Writer

DATELINE: NEW ORLEANS

BODY:

Vietnam veterans from Louisiana and Mississippi have added \$960 million to the tens of billions of dollars already being demanded in lawsuits against chemical companies that manufactured the toxic herbicide Agent Orange.

"The ballpark figure is well over \$50 billion, with a B. I don't know exactly what it is," Dan Bishop of Monsanto Chemical Co. said Friday. Monsanto is one of seven companies named as defendants in a U.S. District Court suit filed here Thursday.

Like other lawsuits concerning Agent Orange, the suit by the Louisiana and Mississippi veterans claims that they, their children and their wives have suffered ailments ranging from boils to cancer and miscarriages because the men were exposed to Agent Orange during duty in Vietnam.

"This is the 84th suit that's been filed, so our comment is the same as we've given on the other 83," Bishop said in a telephone interview from St. Louis.

"Simply stated, available scientific and medical evidence does not support the claims alleged by the veterans in these lawsuits."

Dow Chemical Corp. spokesman Phil Schneider made a similar statement.

He also said the suit was unnecessary because the plaintiffs could have added their names to a master class action suit pending in federal court in Long Island, N.Y.

"I can only assume this was an effort to attract additional publicity," Schneider said in a telephone interview from Midland, Mich.

Bishop said most of the 83 suits are being consolidated into the Long Island

suit. But he said some, like the one brought by the Louisiana and Mississippi veterans, are individual rather than class actions and stand alone.

In addition to Dow and Monsanto, defendants in the latest suit are Hercules Inc., Uniroyal Merchandising Co., North American Phillips Corp., Thompson-Hayward Chemical Co. and Diamond-Shamrock Corp.

The plaintiffs comprise 84 veterans, 24 of their wives and 60 of their children.

The United States used Agent Orange to defoliate large areas of Vietnam, but there is concern now that it may have contributed to ailments ranging from nervousness to cancer among servicemen exposed to it.

These are blamed on exposure to dioxin, a poisonous contaminant in the now-banned herbicide.

The suit claims the companies either ignored or should have known about the contamination, and had both a moral and legal obligation to let the troops know the weed-killer could make them ill.

The suit also accuses the companies of fraud for "falsely and knowingly" representing that the herbicide was safe and harmless for its intended use, when it was not.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH