

The European Regulatory Authorities are colluding with a Corporation involved in the Holocaust

Complaint to the European Ombudsman

On 17 May 2017, I wrote an Open Letter to the European Chemicals Agency about glyphosate's toxicity to aquatic invertebrates and to human reproduction

12 June 2017

Dear Ms Mason

Thank you for your email dated 1 May and the open letter dated 17 May. Please note that we can only respond concerning ECHA's role in assessing the hazardous properties of glyphosate. Anything that does not have a direct effect on the assessment of RAC is outside of the scope of ECHA's mandate.

We here respond to the issues raised which are of relevance to the CLH process:

Regarding the paper written with Monsanto/GTF support and the influence of these in the CLH process: You might like to consult our response to this issue, which has been published on the ECHA website.¹

It is important to distinguish between original study reports and reviews/position papers. The former may be sponsored by Industry, but if conducted in a GLP certified laboratory in accordance with GLP and OECD Guidelines, there is reason to expect them to be reliable. As pointed out in my previous response, a GLP accredited laboratory is not likely to manipulate results to please a sponsor. They are audited and the consequences of being caught cheating would be severe. Therefore, such studies are given greatest weight in assessing the classification of a substance. Review articles are interpretation of the data from other studies and are therefore given less weight. A body such as RAC is tasked with an assessment of data submitted in the CLH dossier and during the public consultation. Publications from other sources such as IARC as well as other regulatory bodies are not ignored (but the conclusions of RAC will not necessarily be the same). Regarding the papers in *Crit. Rev. Toxic.* which were referred to in your letter, these were disclosed as having been sponsored by industry, which of course is (sic) taken into account by any cautious reader.

It is correct that ECHA does not assess risks, only hazards, in the CLH process. This is in accordance with the provisions of the CLP Regulation. ECHA's mandate does not extend, for example, to GM crops.

We note your concerns for the environment. Please note that any conclusion on classification for environmental toxicity is based on the results from standard tests which have been assessed against criteria in the CLP Regulation. In relation to your statement that "*the German Federal Institute of Risk Assessment (BfR) claimed in its reassessment that glyphosate wasn't toxic to the environment*", it is not clear what reassessment is referred to. In the CLH proposal Germany in fact proposed that the existing classification of glyphosate as Aquatic chronic 2 (*Toxic to aquatic life with long lasting effects*) be retained, and this was agreed to by RAC."

Best regards,

Jack de Bruijn

The Judges of the International Monsanto Tribunal mentioned ECHA's classification ²

In brief, the five judges of the Monsanto Tribunal agreed that:

- **Monsanto has violated human rights to food, health, a healthy environment and the freedom indispensable for independent scientific research.**
- **'ecocide' should be recognized as a crime in international law.**
- **human rights and environmental laws are undermined by corporate-friendly trade and investment regulation.**

¹ <https://echa.europa.eu/chemicals-in-our-life/hot-topics/glyphosate> .

² http://www.monsanto-tribunal.org/upload/asset_cache/1016160509.pdf

Extracts: The UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, an independent expert, calls for the need to follow the precautionary principle at the global level. The Tribunal concludes that Monsanto has engaged in practices that negatively impacted the right to health.”

Question 3 concerned the alleged infringement on the right to the highest attainable standard of health of everyone can reach, as recognized in Article 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, or the right of child to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health, as recognized by Article 24 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Paragraph 2 Secondly, glyphosate (ingredient in Roundup) is considered in some studies as a carcinogenic product while other reports, such as the one from the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), conclude the opposite. In an opinion issued on the 15th of March 2017 and related to the classification of glyphosate, the **European Chemicals Agency** (ECHA) indeed estimated that this product could not be classified as a carcinogen, as a mutagen or as toxic for reproduction. The Tribunal however stresses that this classification does not take into account the risks of exposure, with residues found in food, drinking water and even in human urine.

Koffi Dogbevi, Lawyer for the International Monsanto Tribunal, also commented adversely on the ECHA’s classification

“It is interesting to see that ECHA's Committee for Risk Assessment (RAC) agreed to maintain the classification of glyphosate as a substance causing serious and irreversible effect on the eye (Eye Dam. 1, H318) and being toxic to aquatic life with long-lasting effects (Aquatic Chronic 2, H411), and at the same time reaching the conclusion that glyphosate is safe and non-hazardous. While this imbroglio seems to relate to the distinction between hazard (the intrinsic potential to cause harm) and risk (the probability of harm occurring at a given exposure), **it is clear that any reasonable person would assert that a product causing an irreversible harm on the eye, and having a long-lasting toxicity impact on aquatic life, is likely a dangerous product.**

Hazardous materials/substances were covered, in the European Union under the Dangerous Substances Directive (DSD) and the Dangerous Preparations Directive (DPD), regulations that are currently replaced by the EC Regulation No 1272/2008 of 16 December 2008 on the classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures. It is very interesting to notice that glyphosate is listed under the EC Regulation No 1272/2008 as substance causing eye irritation (Eye Dam. 1, H318), toxic to the aquatic environment (Aquatic Chronic 2, H411), and having an acute toxicity (H302) which is a Hazard Category 4. However, it is very troubling to see that the ECHA not only voluntarily omitted the acute toxicity characteristic (H302/ hazard category 4) of glyphosate, but also exonerate itself of any risk assessment task that may lead to unexpected or non-provisionary outcome, and classified glyphosate as safe and non-hazardous substance.”

Open Letter: Head of Unit Pesticides and Biocides and Senior Scientist Chemical Regulations Division 04 June 2018 (Extracts)

Klaus Berend

Head of Unit

European Commission, Directorate-General for Health and Food and Feed safety, Innovation, Pesticides and Biocides

Cc Dave Bench UK CRD

Dear Klaus Berend

I am fully aware that you are not an expert in Pesticides and Biocides, but an expert in the REACH specifications of plastics in aviation. Nor was the previous holder of the post, Michael Flüh, who was a non-scientist. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that your letter to me displayed a lack of knowledge of the subject. Does the Commissioner for Health Vytenis Andriukaitis have a shortage of qualified candidates to choose from to fill the post of Head of Unit, as specified by Jean-Claude Juncker?

European Commission decision on middle management staff³

Page 2 (2) Middle managers should not only have a *very good knowledge of their subject areas*, they should also be outstanding in managing work and people.

Page 5 Article 4 The role of heads of unit is regarded as particularly important. They shall possess specific management (i.e. work organisation, people management and, where relevant, financial resources management) competencies and *an appropriate degree of specialist knowledge and technical expertise*.

You said: "*In your correspondence, among others, you allege that the Commission is colluding with chemical corporations and I would like to strongly refute this allegation.*" **I repeat this statement.**

European Chemical Agency Report on the reassessment of glyphosate. This formed the basis of the European Commission's renewal of glyphosate's licence for 5 years⁴

Published 15/03/2017 ECHA said the available scientific evidence did not meet the criteria to classify glyphosate as a carcinogen, as a mutagen or as toxic for reproduction but it was **classified as causing serious eye damage and as being toxic to aquatic life with long lasting effects**.

Why did the final version of the proposal on glyphosate omit the full classification?

The President of the European Commission, Jean-Claude Juncker, signed the Final version of the commission proposal. It says: "*In its opinion, the Committee for Risk Assessment of the Agency (European Chemicals Agency) concluded by consensus that on the basis of the information currently available, no hazard classification for carcinogenicity is justified for glyphosate.*" The omission of the full classification would appear to be intentionally fraudulent.⁵

The European Glyphosate Task Force (GTF) drew up European Legislation⁶

Monsanto Europe replied to Health Commissioner Andriukaitis on 04/04/2016 to say that the 24 GTF members were prepared to grant very limited access to the data.

From this we learn that the current EU legislation is set up to "*protect intellectual property and confidential information from public disclosure. All confidential data ...shall be deleted or redacted (Regulation 1107/2009, Article 63).*" Much of the industry data submitted to the German Rapporteur Member State was redacted.

The GTF also said: Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) have no role in the legislative procedure⁷

"The renewal process is legislated for by means of a Commission Regulation. The European Parliament has no official role in this particular type of legislative procedure. However, MEPs typically engage in the debate surrounding the renewal process in other ways, such as tabling Parliamentary Questions on the issue."

However, four MEPs wrote to Judge Vince Chhabria Re: Declassified Documents Related to Monsanto and Roundup This was the reply.

Dear Members of the European Parliament:

³ https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/european-commission-decision-on-middle-management-staff_3288_c_2016_en.pdf

⁴ <https://echa.europa.eu/-/glyphosate-not-classified-as-a-carcinogen-by-echa>

⁵

https://ec.europa.eu/food/sites/food/files/plant/docs/pesticides_glyphosate_commission_proposal_final_version.pdf

⁶ https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/cwt/files/letter_1.pdf

⁷ http://www.glyphosate.eu/system/files/sidebar-files/renewal_process_for_glyphosate_faqs.pdf

Thank you for your interest in the ongoing federal litigation regarding the carcinogenic properties of the widely-used herbicide, glyphosate. We avidly share your commitment to the principles of transparent and rigorous scientific assessment in efforts to protect public and environmental health. Your July 4, 2017 letter to Judge Vince Chhabria raises a number of concerns which transcend the immediate exigencies of the litigation and **implicate serious international regulatory, public health, and scientific issues**. We hope to aid your European institutions in reaching a consensus on the safety profile of glyphosate based on an impartial and comprehensive review of the available data...⁸

I challenged ECHA about authorising a chemical that has such dangerous effects

I wrote repeatedly to Geert Dancet: “*Are you trying to divert attention from the fact that ECHA’s Risk Assessment Committee (RAC) classifies glyphosate as a chemical that wipes out salmon and trout from rivers and causes blindness in humans from cataracts and macular degeneration?*”

Finally, Geert Dancet warned me. If I persisted on the same subject, ECHA would not reply

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject:RE: US Lawsuit against Monsanto causing cancers
Date:Wed, 20 Sep 2017 06:34:28 +0000
From:DANCET Geert <Geert.DANCET@echa.europa.eu>
To:R MASON <rosemary.mason01@btinternet.com>

Dear Ms Mason,

Thank you for your email to ECHA dated 6 September.

As noted in our previous response, ECHA can only respond to glyphosate-related comments which concern the harmonised classification and labelling (CLH) process. We again stress that in the CLH process ECHA does not assess the risks of substances, only their hazards, in accordance with the provisions of the CLP Regulation. Hence ECHA is not in a position to respond to issues relating to the assessment of the risks associated with the use of glyphosate. ECHA is also not involved in the approval of the active substances used in plant protection products – the relevant decision-making process is ongoing in the European Commission.

ECHA’s responses can only be restricted to issues which are within the remit of our Agency. The issues which you have raised in your email are either not within ECHA’s remit or have been addressed in previous correspondence. To avoid repeating the same message, **I wish to inform you that we will not be responding any correspondence received from you in future unless it raises any issues on which ECHA considers it has responsibility.**

Yours sincerely,

Geert Dancet
 Executive Director
 European Chemicals Agency

Annankatu 18, P.O. Box 400, FI-00120 Helsinki, Finland
 Tel. +358 9 6861 8200
geert.dancet@echa.europa.eu

⁸ <http://baumhedlundlaw.com/pdf/monsanto-documents/Roundup-Letter-to-EU-FINAL.pdf>

Letter to Bernhard Url on 9 October 2017 (Extracts)

I sent you and [Michael Flüh](#), former Head of Pesticide Unit, Health and Consumers Directorate General (DG Sante) European Commission (who wasn't even a scientist), the two photo-journals of our small nature reserve which had been poisoned by Roundup, but you and the European Commission failed to acknowledge them. ECHA did acknowledge them. Jack de Bruijn, in charge of risk assessment, explains that ECHA's role is in the labelling and classification of chemicals. "*We only look at the hazardous properties of a chemical,*" he said, "*not at the risks that occur when you use a chemical.*"

EFSA asked the Glyphosate Task Force to approve what they wrote about glyphosate⁹

Emails reveal between industry and EFSA: "*The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) asked glyphosate producers to decide which bits of its final report on the herbicide were confidential and accepted comments on the conclusions in the days running up to the final publication. EFSA's ways of working are revealed in a series of email exchanges between its staff and the consultancy acting for the industry body, the Glyphosate Task Force (GTF) which represents 24 manufacturers including Monsanto.*

The emails show that EFSA sent the final report and conclusions to the European Commission and the consultancy firm, Dr Knoell Consulting, on 30 October."

On 11 November, Dr Knoell Consulting wrote: "I have received the feedback from the task force now that they agreed to what is outlined. So please proceed with publishing."

A further email from EFSA to the consultant on 16 November thanks them "for the proposals for the removal of sensitive information from the final addendum for the active substance glyphosate.

"Your proposals have all been accepted and no changes were applied to the file."

EFSA asks for "for your agreement" to publish the document by 19 November."

How did the US EPA and IARC reach opposite conclusions about glyphosate's genotoxicity?¹⁰

An important paper by Charles Benbrook was published on 14 January 2019 in *Environmental Sciences Europe*.

"Many people around the world still struggle to understand how and why the [US EPA](#) and the European Food Safety Authority ([EFSA](#)) concluded that the herbicide active ingredient glyphosate is not genotoxic (damaging to DNA) or carcinogenic, whereas the World Health Organisation's cancer agency IARC came to the opposite conclusion. IARC stated that the evidence for glyphosate's genotoxic potential is "[strong](#)" and that glyphosate is a probable human carcinogen.

While IARC referenced only peer-reviewed studies and reports available in the public literature, [EPA](#) relied heavily on unpublished regulatory studies commissioned by pesticide manufacturers. In fact, 95 of the 151 genotoxicity assays cited in EPA's evaluation were from industry studies (63%), while IARC cited 100% public literature sources.

Another important difference is that [EPA](#) focused its analysis on glyphosate in its pure chemical form, or "glyphosate technical". The problem with that is that almost no one is exposed to glyphosate alone. Applicators and the public are exposed to complete herbicide formulations consisting of glyphosate plus added ingredients (adjuvants). The formulations have repeatedly been shown to be more toxic than glyphosate in isolation.

Further [support](#) for many of these measures comes from the European Parliament's [PEST Committee](#), which was set up in response to the concerns raised by the European Citizens' Initiative to ban glyphosate, the Monsanto Papers (internal Monsanto documents disclosed in cancer litigation in the USA revealing how industry has subverted science), and the discrepancies in the cancer assessments of glyphosate between the European institutions and the IARC.

In an unusual step, the editor-in-chief of *Environmental Sciences Europe*, Prof Henner Hollert, and his co-author Prof Thomas Backhaus, weighed in with a strong statement in support of the acceptance of Dr Benbrook's article for publication.¹¹ In a commentary published in the same issue of the journal,

⁹ <https://corporateeurope.org/efsa/2017/07/industry-edited-efsa-glyphosate-evaluation-ahead-publication>

¹⁰ <https://www.gmwatch.org/en/news/archive/2019/18699>

¹¹ <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12302-018-0184-7>

they wrote, “*We are convinced that the article provides new insights on why different conclusions regarding the carcinogenicity of glyphosate and GBHs [glyphosate-based herbicides] were reached by the US EPA and IARC. It is an important contribution to the discussion on the genotoxicity of GBHs.*”

Conclusions

“In the case of glyphosate-based herbicides, the world’s most widely-used pesticide ever, such relatively high-exposure episodes occur tens of thousands of times on a daily basis in the US and hundreds of thousands, if not millions of times globally.

IARC’s evaluation relied heavily on studies capable of shedding light on the distribution of real-world exposures and genotoxicity risk in exposed human populations, while EPA’s evaluation placed little or no weight on such evidence.”

Defra also confirmed that only glyphosate was considered in European Regulatory assessments

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject:Request for information - Ref: TO2018/05500

Date:Tue, 13 Mar 2018 13:45:53 +0000

From:correspondence.section@defra.gsi.gov.uk on behalf of Ministerial Contact Unit

[<correspondence.section@defra.gsi.gov.uk>](mailto:correspondence.section@defra.gsi.gov.uk)

Reply-To:Ministerial Contact Unit [<correspondence.section@defra.gsi.gov.uk>](mailto:correspondence.section@defra.gsi.gov.uk)

To:rosemary.mason01@btinternet.com

Dear Ms Mason,

Thank you for your recent emails to xxxxxxxxxxxx. I have been asked to reply on behalf of Defra. Pesticide active substances such as glyphosate are assessed at EU level and the European Commission takes the decision on whether each active substance should be approved. Products containing approved active substances are assessed and decisions on authorisation are taken at national level. Applicants for authorisation must show that their products are effective and **have no harmful effects to people or unacceptable effects on the environment**. If their products were to pose such risks, they would not be authorised; or if such effects were discovered later, they would be withdrawn. As you point out, the European Commission has renewed the approval of glyphosate until December 2022. This followed reviews of the scientific data by the European Food Safety Authority and the European Chemicals Agency's Committee for Risk Assessment. **Those reviews found no safety concerns that would prevent continuing approval.**

Following the Commission decision, the UK and all other Member States will review the authorisations of **every product containing glyphosate to ensure that they meet the current legal requirements and safety standards**. The rules for this review are set out in EU legislation and guidance documents. The review will be carried out by the Health and Safety Executive as the UK competent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Defra

Ministerial Contact Unit

Weedkiller found in 43 out of 45 popular breakfast cereals marketed for US children

We read an article in the *Guardian* on 16 August 2018 about weedkiller found in breakfast cereals marketed for children in the US.

“Significant levels of the weedkilling chemical glyphosate have been found in an array of popular breakfast cereals, oats and snack bars marketed to US children, a new study has found.¹² Tests revealed glyphosate, the active ingredient in the popular weedkiller brand Roundup, present in all but two of the 45 oat-derived products that were sampled by the Environmental Working Group, a public health organization. Nearly three in four of the products exceeded what the EWG classes safe for children to consume. Products with some of the highest levels of glyphosate include granola, oats and

¹² <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/aug/16/weedkiller-cereal-monsanto-roundup-childrens-food>

snack bars made by leading industry names Quaker, Kellogg's and General Mills, which makes Cheerios.”

In April 2018, internal emails obtained from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) showed that scientists have found glyphosate on a wide range of commonly consumed food, to the point that they were finding it difficult to identify a food without the chemical on it. The FDA has yet to release any official results from this process. **The UK Guardian reported:** “*There was no indication that the claims related to products sold outside the US.*”

Weedkiller found in samples of oat-based marketed for children in the UK

In order to check this fact, we sent four samples of oat-based cereals marketed for children in the UK (bought from our local supermarket in Wales) to a Health Research Institute in Iowa. The Director said the levels of glyphosate were shockingly high. Dr Fagan said in his report: “*These results are consistently concerning. The levels consumed in a single daily helping of any one of these cereals, even the one with the lowest level of contamination, is sufficient to put the person's glyphosate levels above the levels that cause fatty liver disease in rats (and likely in people).*”

| Type of breakfast cereal marketed for children Product description | Glyphosate level ng/g | AMPA ng/g | Effective glyphosate level ng/g |
|--|-----------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|
| Kelloggs No added sugar granola with Apricot & pumpkin seeds | 499.90 | ND | 499.90 |
| Quaker/Oat So simple/Original Microwaveable Oats | 464.23 | 24.04 | 500.28 |
| Weetibix Oatibix 100% wholegrain oats | 318.85 | 16.96 | 344.28 |
| Nestle Multigrain Cheerios Whole Grain Oat Flour 29.6% Whole Grain Wheat 29.6% Whole Grain Barley Flour 17.9% Whole Grain Corn Flour 2.1% Whole Grain Rice Flour 2.1%. | 137.29 | ND | 137.29 |

We sent the results to the Editor of *Guardian* Letters, Paul Chadwick, so the public would be informed, but it was never published. However, the *Daily Mail* did report it.¹³

Bayer CropScience (under a different name) colluded with the Nazis in the Holocaust

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject:Open Letter to Bayer CropScience

Date:Mon, 7 Jan 2019 10:24:53 +0000

From:Rosemary Anne Mason <rosemary.mason01@btinternet.com>

To:werner.baumann@bayer.com, david.fischer@bayer.com, liam.condon@bayer.com

Werner Baumann
Chief Executive
Bayer CropScience

Dear Werner Baumann

An advertisement that Bayer placed in Politico and the Farmers' Guardian on 19/12/2018¹⁴

“Transparency creates trust. At Bayer, we embrace our responsibility to communicate how we assess our products' safety — and we recognize that people around the world want more information around glyphosate. This month, we published more than 300 study summaries on the safety of glyphosate on our dedicated [transparency website](#). “

¹³ <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-6315209/Revealed-UK-cereals-contain-potentially-harmful-amounts-WEEDKILLER.html>

¹⁴ <https://www.cropscience-transparency.bayer.com/en/News/News-Bucket/2018/11/20181121-Glyphosate>

Bayer CropScience has never been transparent in its life

Formerly IG Farben, the private German chemicals company allied with the Nazis, that manufactured the [Zyklon B](#) gas used to commit genocide against millions of European Jews in the [Holocaust](#). It built a factory next to Auschwitz, Poland, so it could exploit Jewish slave labour in its oil and rubber production plant. In total, some 300,000 detainees from Auschwitz were employed in IG Farben's workforce, supplying the company with free labour. The company housed the workers in its own concentration camp, with the horrendous conditions there and in the factory leading to an estimated 30,000 deaths. On top of this, an unknown number of workers deemed unfit to continue working at the factory were sent to the death camp at Auschwitz. Alongside the brutal conditions of the labour camp, IG Farben also sanctioned drug experiments on live, healthy inmates. IG Farben was probably the most well-known corporate participant in the Holocaust, and the company's history sheds a chilling light on how genocide became tied in with economics and business.¹⁵

At the end of the war, after the Nuremberg Trials, the company itself was dissolved into three separate divisions, Hoescht, Bayer, and BASF. Monsanto was a firm created by the Rockefeller Foundation.¹⁶ Monsanto partners with [I.G. Farben](#), makers of Bayer aspirin and the Third Reich's go-to chemical manufacturer producing deadly Zyklon-B gas during World War II.

The European Regulatory Authorities are colluding with a Corporation involved in the Holocaust

I would be grateful if the European Ombudsman would investigate my complaint urgently.

Yours sincerely

Rosemary Mason MB, ChB, FRCA

¹⁵ <https://www.newhistorian.com/ig-farben-opens-factory-at-auschwitz/3822/>

¹⁶ <https://www.globalresearch.ca/the-complete-history-of-monsanto-the-worlds-most-evil-corporation/5387964>