

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Donald Bandler to Glyn Davies, et al., re: EU decision on GMO corn and rapeseed (aka canola) (3 pages)	03/19/1998	P1/b(1) VZ 11/26/2019
002. email	Penelope O'Brien to Geoffrey Odlum, et al., re: GMO whereabouts [partial] (1 page)	05/01/1998	P1/b(1) KBY 8/24/2019
003. email	Geoffrey Odlum to William Antholis, et al., re: GMO whereabouts [partial] (1 page)	05/01/1998	P1/b(1) KBY 8/24/2019
004. email	Nancy McElowney to Nancy Maxfield, re: Bowles Letter on GMO Corn (2 pages)	07/28/1998	P1/b(1) VZ 11/26/2019
005. email	D. Holly Hammonds to David Sandalow, re: [GMOs] (7 pages)	06/14/1999	P1/b(1) VZ 4/3/2020
006. email	D. Holly Hammonds to Bruce McNamer, re: [GMOs] [duplicate of 004] (7 pages)	06/14/1999	P1/b(1) VZ 4/9/2020
007. email	Bruce McNamer to Richard Holtzapfel, re: GMO Backgrounder (4 pages)	06/17/1999	P1/b(1) VZ 4/9/2020
008. email	Lawrence Butler to Bruce McNamer, re: [GMO strategy] (14 pages)	06/18/1999	P1/b(1) VZ 4/3/2020

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
Exchange - Record (Sept 97 - Jan 01) ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 620000

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/19/1998 - 06/23/1999]

2013-0836-F

ke3022

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/19/98 8:52:05 AM
FROM Bandler, Donald K.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: EU decision on GMO corn and rapeseed (aka canola) [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Davies, Glyn T.
Dejban, Donna D.
Friedrich, Mary K.
Helweg, M. Diana
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Malley, Robert
Millison, Cathy L.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Storey, Sharon V.

CARBON_COPY Crowley, Philip J.
Dehqanzada, Yahya A.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Bandler, Donald K.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Braden, Susan R.
Brown, Keirn C.
Butler, Lawrence E.
Covey, James P.
Dowling, John N. (Nick)
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Marshall, Betty A.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McEldowney, Nancy E.
Quinn, Mary E.
Sapiro, Miriam E.

TEXT_BODY Please pass to Sandy and Jim -- we are coordinating actively with USTR, USEU and State on text of statement and to be certain a statement wouldn't create a backlash. Don

-----Original Message-----

From: Butler,
Lawrence E.

Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998 8:45 AM

To: @EUROPE
- European Affairs; @INTECON - Economic Affairs
Cc: @PLANNING -
Strat Plan & Comm
Subject: EU decision on GMO corn and rapeseed
(aka canola) [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

UNCLAS BRUSSELS
001717

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: EAGR, ETRD, EUN
SUBJECT: EU COMMITTEE
APPROVES GMO'S

1. THE EU COMMISSION'S ARTICLE 21 COMMITTEE TODAY
VOTED
TO APPROVE ALL THREE VARIETIES OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED
CORN,
AS WELL AS GENETICALLY-MODIFIED RAPESEED.

2. DETAILS OF THE VOTE
ARE NOT YET AVAILABLE, ALTHOUGH
THE RESULTS SUGGEST THAT A NUMBER
OF MEMBER STATES WHO
HAD BEEN LEANING TOWARDS ABSTENTION WERE PERSUADED
TO
VOTE IN FAVOR. SOURCES SAY IRELAND, GREECE, DENMARK AND
SWEDEN
MIXED THEIR VOTES ON DIFFERENT VARIETIES, AND THAT
FRANCE ABSTAINED
ON ALL THREE CORNS.

3. NORMALLY, FROM AN ARTICLE 21 VOTE TO A
FINAL OFFICIAL
APPROVAL TAKES TWO TO THREE WEEKS; HOWEVER, WE MUST
CAUTION
THAT THIS HAS NOT BEEN A "NORMAL" CASE.

4. AFFECTED COMPANIES
HAVE EXPRESSED THEIR DELIGHT WITH
THE OUTCOME.

5. ADDITIONAL
DETAILS AND A VOTE BREAKDOWN WILL BE
PROVIDED SEPTTEL. THE OFFICIAL
PRESS RELEASE WILL BE
FAXED TO WASHINGTON AGENCIES (NOTE FROM LARRY
-- I HAVE COPIES IN MY OFFICE)

AS SOON AS IT IS OBTAINED.
(DRAFTED:RGIFFORD)
WEAVER

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/19/98 10:15:12 AM
FROM Boone, Sherman G.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: EU GMO decision press statement [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Lee, Malcolm R.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY see attached!

-----Original Message-----

From: Butler, Lawrence

E.

Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998 10:11 AM

To: Bandler, Donald

K.

Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs; @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm;

@INTECON

- Economic Affairs

Subject: EU GMO decision press statement [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Don- awaiting clearance from State, USTR and USEU.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

presstatementGMOcornmarch19.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
Location

March 19, 1998

EUROPEAN DECISION ON BIO-ENGINEERED CROPS

We welcome the European Union's announcement yesterday to

approve the European Commission's proposals to release to market a number of bio-engineered products. These include corn from the United States with an export value of \$1.2 billion.

This has been an issue of high level interest for American business. The Administration has worked closely with industry during lengthy consultations with the European Union to ensure a decision based on scientific fact. The President raised this question during the December U.S.-EU Summit. We have been in constant touch with EU member states and the Commission since then.

The European Union based its approval on its own and independent scientific advice. The United States, which had reached the same conclusion concerning our own market, is gratified at the result. This decision is a model of cooperation in resolving trade issues involving new technologies that stand to benefit our societies, our economies and the environment.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/19/98 10:41:03 AM
FROM Blinken, Antony J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: EU GMO decision press statement [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bandler, Donald K.
Bandler, Donald K.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Braden, Susan R.
Brown, Keirn C.
Butler, Lawrence E.
Covey, James P.
Dowling, John N. (Nick)
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Marshall, Betty A.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McEldowney, Nancy E.
Quinn, Mary E.
Sapiro, Miriam E.
Crowley, Philip J.
Dehqanzada, Yahya A.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Once you have NSA clearance, you need to get this to NSC press ASAP
- they will do the liaisoning with McCurry..

-----Original Message-----

From: Bandler,
Donald K.
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998 10:29 AM
To: Blinken,
Antony J.
Subject: RE: EU GMO decision press statement [UNCLASSIFIED]

what time will Mike use it?

-----Original Message-----

From: Blinken,
Antony J.

Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998 10:28 AM
To: Bandler,
Donald K.
Subject: RE: EU GMO decision press statement [UNCLASSIFIED]

looks
good. thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: Bandler, Donald
K.
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998 10:18 AM
To: Blinken, Antony
J.
Subject: FW: EU GMO decision press statement [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

we
just reworked this -- work for you?

-----Original Message-----

From: Butler,
Lawrence E.
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998 10:11 AM
To: Bandler,
Donald K.
Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs; @PLANNING - Strat Plan &
Comm; @INTECON - Economic Affairs
Subject: EU GMO decision press
statement [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

<< File: presstatementGMOcornmarch19.doc
>> Don- awaiting clearance from State, USTR and USEU.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/19/98 11:20:45 AM
FROM Maxfield, Nancy H.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: EU GMO decision press statement [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Kale, Dora A.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

-----Original Message-----

From: Blinken, Antony J.
Sent: Thursday,
March 19, 1998 10:41 AM
To: Bandler, Donald K.; @EUROPE - European
Affairs; @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: RE: EU GMO decision press
statement [UNCLASSIFIED]

Once you have NSA clearance, you need
to get this to NSC press ASAP - they will do the liaisioning with
McCurry..

-----Original Message-----

From: Bandler, Donald K.

Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998 10:29 AM
To: Blinken, Antony J.
Subject: RE:
EU GMO decision press statement [UNCLASSIFIED]

what time
will Mike use it?

-----Original Message-----

From: Blinken, Antony
J.
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998 10:28 AM
To: Bandler, Donald
K.
Subject: RE: EU GMO decision press statement [UNCLASSIFIED]

looks

good. thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: Bandler, Donald

K.

Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998 10:18 AM

To: Blinken, Antony

J.

Subject: FW: EU GMO decision press statement [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

we

just reworked this -- work for you?

-----Original Message-----

From: Butler,

Lawrence E.

Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998 10:11 AM

To: Bandler,

Donald K.

Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs; @PLANNING - Strat Plan &
Comm; @INTECON - Economic Affairs

Subject: EU GMO decision press
statement [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

<< File: presstatementGMOcornmarch19.doc

>> Don- awaiting clearance from State, USTR and USEU.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/19/98 12:11:17 PM
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: EU GMO decision press statement [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Lee, Malcolm R.
Butler, Lawrence E.
Bandler, Donald K.

CARBON_COPY Crowley, Philip J.
Dehqanzada, Yahya A.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gobush, Matthew N.
Gray, Wendy E.
Halperin, David E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Widmer, Edward L.
Antholis, William J.
Boone, Sherman G.
Kyle, Robert D.
Lee, Malcolm R.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
O'Brien, Penelope R.
Odlum, Geoffrey M.

TEXT_BODY Dora just called to say that SRB approves with no changes.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Lee, Malcolm R.

Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998

12:05 PM

To: Butler, Lawrence E.; Bandler, Donald K.

Cc: @PRESS

- Public Affairs; @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm; @INTECON - Economic Affairs

Subject: RE: EU GMO decision press statement [UNCLASSIFIED]

USTR

had concerns about use of phrase "model of cooperation" due to politicization of EU process to approve their own scientific findings. Did USTR provide alternative language? ML

-----Original Message-----

From: Butler,

Lawrence E.

Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998 10:11 AM

To: Bandler,

Donald K.

Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs; @PLANNING - Strat Plan &
Comm; @INTECON - Economic Affairs

Subject: EU GMO decision press
statement [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

<< File: presstatementGMOcornmarch19.doc

>> Don- awaiting clearance from State, USTR and USEU.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/19/98 12:14:18 PM

FROM Kale, Dora A.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT FW: Final GMO press draft for NSA approval [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Bandler, Donald K.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Braden, Susan R.
Brown, Keirn C.
Butler, Lawrence E.
Covey, James P.
Dowling, John N. (Nick)
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Marshall, Betty A.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McEldowney, Nancy E.
Quinn, Mary E.
Sapiro, Miriam E.
Crowley, Philip J.
Dehqanzada, Yahya A.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gobush, Matthew N.
Gray, Wendy E.
Halperin, David E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Widmer, Edward L.

CARBON_COPY Bartlett, L. June
Davies, Glyn T.
Dejban, Donna D.
Friedrich, Mary K.
Helweg, M. Diana
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hurwitz, Marc I.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Malley, Robert
Millison, Cathy L.

Poole, Jennifer C.
Rice, Edward A.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Storey, Sharon V.

TEXT_BODY

SRB has read and approves statement as is. (Have already called NSC/Press to tell them its o.k.)

-----Original Message-----

From: Bandler,
Donald K.
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 1998 10:58 AM
To: @NSA - Natl
Security Advisor
Subject: FW: Final GMO press draft for NSA approval
[UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

Please forward urgently to Jim
and Sandy to approve for use by Mike McCurry today. We have
USTR,
State and USEU agreement to the draft. It is carefully tuned to
minimize any chance of creating a French or EU counterreactionavoid

-- since there are two remaining steps in the weeks ahead. On balance,
this should help box them in to taking the right steps. Don

-----Original
Message-----

From: Butler, Lawrence E.
Sent: Thursday, March 19,
1998 10:55 AM
To: Bandler, Donald K.
Subject: Final GMO press draft
for NSA approval [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

Don -- to tee
over to Jim?

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

presstatementGMOcornmarch19.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
Location

March 19, 1998

EUROPEAN DECISION ON BIO-ENGINEERED CROPS

We welcome the European Union's announcement yesterday of its vote in favor of the European Commission's proposals to release to market a number of bio-engineered products. These include corn and corn products from the United States with an export value of over one billion dollars.

This has been an issue of high level interest for American business. The Administration has worked closely with industry during lengthy consultations with the European Union to ensure a decision based on scientific fact. The President raised this question during the December U.S.-EU Summit. We have worked closely with the Commission and the EU member states since then.

The European Union based its approval on its own and independent scientific advice. The United States had reached the same conclusion concerning our own market. This demonstrates the United States' and European Union's ability to work together in resolving complex trade issues involving new technologies that stand to benefit our societies, our economies and the environment.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Penelope O'Brien to Geoffrey Odium, et al., re: GMO wherabouts [partial] (1 page)	05/01/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
Exchange - Record (Sept 97 - Jan 01) ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 620000

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/19/1998 - 06/23/1999]

2013-0836-F
ke3022

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 5/1/98 7:26:36 AM
FROM O'Brien, Penelope R.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: GMO whereabouts [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Odlum, Geoffrey M.
Antholis, William J.
Boone, Sherman G.

DECLASSIFIED IN PART
PER E. O. 13526

2016-0529-M (3.17)
3/6/2019 KBH

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY we'll miss you....

-----Original Message-----

From: Odlum, Geoffrey
M.

Sent: Friday, May 01, 1998 7:26 AM

To: Antholis, William J.;

Boone, Sherman G.; O'Brien, Penelope R.

Subject: GMO whereabouts
[UNCLASSIFIED]

gang -- i'll be back and forth today. if i'm not
there, I'm here (at diana's #: 69494). we just got copies from CIA
of "key players at the birmingham summit" - EO 13526 3.5c so
we can check that off the list of things owed us.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	Geoffrey Odlum to William Antholis, et al., re: GMO whereabouts [partial] (1 page)	05/01/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
Exchange - Record (Sept 97 - Jan 01) ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 620000

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/19/1998 - 06/23/1999]

2013-0836-F
ke3022

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 5/1/98 8:26:54 AM
FROM Odum, Geoffrey M.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: GMO whereabouts [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Antholis, William J.
Boone, Sherman G.
O'Brien, Penelope R.

DECLASSIFIED IN PART
PER E. O. 13526

2016-0529-m (3.18)
3/6/2019 KBH

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

CIA also dropped off a good-looking booklet on "key issues" for Birmingham (and for the Ministerial). next time you're over here, we should get it out of here and over to 227 for safekeeping...

-----Original

Message-----

From: Odum, Geoffrey M.

Sent: Friday, May 01, 1998

7:26 AM

To: Antholis, William J.; Boone, Sherman G.; O'Brien, Penelope R.

Subject: GMO whereabouts [UNCLASSIFIED]

gang -- i'll be back

and forth today. if i'm not there, I'm here (at diana's #: 69494).

we just got copies from CIA of "key players at the birmingham summit"

- [EO 13526 3.5c] so we can check that off the list of things
owed us.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 7/28/98 10:34:01 AM
FROM McEldowney, Nancy E.
CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
CLASSIFICATIONREASON 1.5(d)
DATECLASSIFIEDON 07/27/1998
DECLASSIFYON 07/27/2008
SUBJECT FW: Bowles Letter on GMO Corn [~~CONFIDENTIAL~~]
TO Maxfield, Nancy H.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Nancy: could you please give Malcolm a few more hours and then start bugging him? I have to send this forward as early as possible today (it is now overdue.) thanks very much.

-----Original Message-----

From: McEldowney,
Nancy E.
Sent: Monday, July 27, 1998 6:58 PM
To: Lee, Malcolm
R.; Maxfield, Nancy H.; Butler, Lawrence E.
Subject: Bowles Letter
on GMO Corn [~~CONFIDENTIAL~~]

Malcom: could I please get you chop on attached? It responds to a shameless attempt by the French Ambo to link our GMO corn case to some French dispute with EPA over herbicides.
Need to send forward tomorrow. Thanks very much.

Larry: memo
will go through you but if you want to fiddle now, pls have at it.

Nancy: could you please format and get ready to go forward?
I put original folder in your in-box. Thanks a lot.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT Doc3.doc
Draft Letter from Bowles

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
White House Guidelines, May 16, 2017
By VL NARA, Date 11/16/2019
156-0574-M

Dear Ambassador Bujon:

Thank you for your recent letter conveying a copy of the French parliamentary report on Genetically Modified Organisms. This is an issue of importance to both our governments and I appreciate your efforts to provide additional information. We look forward to receiving the French decision on the two varieties of American-produced GMO corn currently pending approval within the EU.

I also appreciate you bringing to my attention the deliberations of the French company Rhone-Poulenc with the Environmental Protection Agency. I have taken the liberty of forwarding a copy of your letter to our EPA Administrator, Ms. Carol Browner, to ensure that all appropriate information is available as the deliberations proceed.

Sincerely,

Erskine Bowles

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 9/24/98 1:01:46 PM
FROM Marsh, Thomas S
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Package 3514 - EU Union & biotechnology in Agricultural
[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Starks, Tali T.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Oh, you go!

-----Original Message-----

From: Starks, Tali T.

Sent: Thursday, September 24, 1998 1:01 PM

To: Rice, Edward A.

Cc: @WWD

- West Wing Desk; @INTECON - Economic Affairs

Subject: Package 3514

- EU Union & biotechnology in Agricultural [UNCLASSIFIED]

In
response to your request about the status of Package 3514:

Susan

Dean called Melissa Green in Sperling's office and was told that the package was with either Brainard or Lee. I have spoken with Elaine Mistler in Intecon and she has relayed to me that they aren't able to locate Package 3514. However, in the interim, Records Management is sending them a suspense copy.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 9/24/98 2:26:00 PM
FROM Joshi, M. Kay
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Package 3514 - EU Union & biotechnology in Agricultural
[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Millison, Cathy L.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

-----Original Message-----

From: Mitsler, Elaine M.

Sent: Thursday,
September 24, 1998 2:24 PM

To: Rice, Edward A.

Cc: Joshi, M. Kay

Subject: FW:

Package 3514 - EU Union & biotechnology in Agricultural [UNCLASSIFIED]

Actually,

I told Tali that Action 3514 is not among the classified documents that I am holding in Room 227 and that I flagged west wing concern for Lael and Sharon Yuan (Room 231), and Malcolm (Room 389) along with the message that Melissa Green (Gene Sperling's office) thinks Action 3514 may be with Lael or Malcolm. I also told Tali that I had not heard back from Lael, Sharon, Malcolm or Melissa. As of this writing, Sharon still has not had a chance to look for the package in Room 231 and says now is not a good time to look, Melissa is confident the package is not in Gene's office but she agreed to do one more search through Gene's office, and Malcolm has not yet responded.

-----Original Message-----

From: Starks, Tali T.

Sent: Thursday,
September 24, 1998 1:01 PM

To: Rice, Edward A.

Cc: @WWD - West

Wing Desk; @INTECON - Economic Affairs

Subject: Package 3514 - EU

Union & biotechnology in Agricultural [UNCLASSIFIED]

In response
to your request about the status of Package 3514:

Susan Dean called

Melissa Green in Sperling's office and was told that the package was with either Brainard or Lee. I have spoken with Elaine Mitsler in Intecon and she has relayed to me that they [NEC] aren't able to locate Package 3514. However, in the interim, Records Management is sending them a suspense copy.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/8/98 12:08:13 PM
FROM Osius, Theodore G.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Jurisdictional question: Genetically-modified agricultural exports to Europe [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Davidson, Leslie K.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

FYI - the Chairman/CEO of Monsanto is Bob Shapiro, a member of TABD. He's mostly interested in negotiations with the Europeans over U.S. agricultural products.

-----Original Message-----

From: Davidson,
Leslie K.

Sent: Friday, December 04, 1998 5:07 PM

To: Osius, Theodore
G.

Subject: RE: Jurisdictional question: Genetically-modified agricultural exports to Europe [UNCLASSIFIED]

i can call over to EUR - I know the office director for EUR/ERA. In point of fact, these folks must have just DONE all this for the summit prep, so I suspect the background won't be too hard.

-----Original Message-----

From: Osius, Theodore
G.

Sent: Friday, December 04, 1998 5:03 PM

To: Davidson, Leslie
K.

Subject: FW: Jurisdictional question: Genetically-modified agricultural exports to Europe [UNCLASSIFIED]

OK, I called Pieter and he agreed.

Asked us for background on the EU's position on: 1) labeling of genetically-modified products; 2) corn products; and 3) overall EU policy. If you have ideas about whom to call, I don't mind making the calls, but I'd would expect it's in the EUR bureau at State or equivalent at Commerce and I don't know where to begin. Thanks.
Ted

-----Original Message-----

From: Saunders, Richard M.
Sent: Friday,
December 04, 1998 4:22 PM
To: Davidson, Leslie K.; Osius, Theodore
G.
Subject: RE: Jurisdictional question: Genetically-modified agricultural
exports to Europe [UNCLASSIFIED]

Leslie has this right. (So she
should do it...)

Actually, it should primarily be a domestic/business
outreach/hi-tech issue -- with NSA oversight to keep things in overall
trade policy context as needed.

-----Original Message-----

From: Davidson,
Leslie K.
Sent: Friday, December 04, 1998 2:46 PM
To: Osius, Theodore
G.; Saunders, Richard M.
Subject: RE: Jurisdictional question: Genetically-modified
agricultural exports to Europe [UNCLASSIFIED]

I kind thought it
would be David/Pieter's lead, but that we would have a heavy hand
in shaping the talkers and background paper. Fundamentally, those
folks still want this to be a business outreach meeting. We just
need to make sure the substance is right.

-----Original Message-----

From: Osius,
Theodore G.
Sent: Friday, December 04, 1998 2:44 PM
To: Saunders,
Richard M.
Cc: Davidson, Leslie K.
Subject: Jurisdictional question:
Genetically-modified agricultural exports to Europe [UNCLASSIFIED]

Rick

-

This is one of those gray-area issues, and I don't know who is
supposed to have the lead. David Beier's office (Pieter Boulhower)
has been handling it up to now, but they don't want to step on our
toes. The VP will meet with CEOs of Monsanto and Cargill on December
15 to talk about exporting genetically-modified food products to
Europe. Apparently we were involved in a call to the French agricultural

minister on a similar subject in the past. We need guidance on who is supposed to handle this - can you have a word with David Beier?
Thanks,
Ted

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/3/99 3:16:45 PM
FROM Hammonds, D. Holly
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: GMO DC [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Blinken, Antony J.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Tony: I just got this (just back in saddle barely)...Were you or Larry there??

-----Original Message-----

From: Blinken, Antony J.

Sent: Wednesday, June 02, 1999 8:17 PM

To: @INTECON - Economic Affairs; @EUROPE - European Affairs

Subject: GMO DC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Holly

- i understand there is a DC on GMOs tomorrow (Thursday) in the late a.m. Jim can bring a plus one. Assume that should be you (fine by me as we are swamped by trip papers). Let me know if you are not going. tony.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/7/99 11:22:48 AM

FROM Hachigian, Nina L.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT GMO meeting today at 5 in 180 [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Blinken, Antony J.
Braden, Susan R.
Brown, Keirn C.
Butler, Lawrence E.
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Gordon, Philip H.
Holtzapple, Richard A.
Hurley, C. Michael
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McEldowney, Nancy E.
Moyn, Samuel A.
Quinn, Mary E.
Sapiro, Miriam E.
Schulte, Gregory L.
Uyehara, Margaret A.

CARBON_COPY Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Hammonds, D. Holly

TEXT_BODY Can Larry or Tony be Jim's plus one? Holly is working on paper, but cannot go to the meeting

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/7/99 1:49:45 PM
FROM Sandalow, David B.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: GMO Meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Holtzapple, Richard A.
Blinken, Antony J.
Butler, Lawrence E.

CARBON_COPY Burrell, Christina L.
Lackey, Miles M.
Shapiro, Daniel B.
Tavlarides, Mark J.
McNamer, Bruce

TEXT_BODY Add to "factors to consider": What USG resources (including time of senior policy-makers) would be required to make this a useful exercise?

Since some pockets of State are pushing the idea, shd probably be sure Jim is familiar with it.

-----Original Message-----

From: Holtzapple,
Richard A.
Sent: Monday, June 07, 1999 1:40 PM
To: Blinken, Antony
J.; Butler, Lawrence E.
Cc: @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; McNamer,
Bruce; Sandalow, David B.
Subject: GMO Meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]

Tony/Larry
- take a look at this and see if you think it is helpful for Jim in preparing for today's meeting.

FOR JIM FROM TONY BLINKEN/RICKHOLTZAPPLE:

We
wanted to provide some additional thoughts on ways forward on the GMO issue prior to this afternoon's meeting. State called today to say that they had heard Senator Ashcroft is planning to move ahead

with a resolution calling for the G-8 Summit to address the issue of GMO's. We expect that at today's meeting State will push the proposal that we consider agreeing to a G-8 Working Group, modeled on the Climate Change Working Group, to address this issue.

There may be merit to this idea. One of the problems we have with the Europeans on biotech foods and agriculture is that they continually portray the U.S. as unconcerned about the dangers and unwilling to listen. A Working Group, if properly constituted, could both demonstrate that we are prepared to engage on the issues and provide a forum for explaining the science and procedures behind our handling of these same issues.

Our tactic of pushing to keep this work in the appropriate fora (such as the Codex or the Convention on BioDiversity) helps keep the focus on science, but they are not able to respond in a timely way to developments. One outcome we definitely seek to avoid is being in a situation where our primary method of response will be to take restrictive measures placed on GMOs to the WTO. We should win these cases, but at considerable political cost.

Thus, our objective in such a Working Group would be in applying science more effectively to what is becoming an increasingly political debate. A Working Group could help provide a forum:

- where the various sides can exchange information on both the political pressures on their policies as well as the science backing up (or in the case of the Europeans, not backing up) their positions;
- where higher-level policy-makers would become more familiar with the scientific issues in question.

Some factors to consider if we were to pursue this approach:

- . what would be the scope of the WG's work would be (issues related to the Biosafety Protocol negotiations, the Codex talks, and what else?)
- the WG must be informal enough to avoid undermining the institutions involved, such as the WTO and Codex.
- what participation would help assure the right balance of political and science issues -- we assume the group would need representation from the Foreign, Trade, Environment and Agriculture Ministries,

but should we also include science advisors.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/7/99 1:52:18 PM
FROM Sandalow, David B.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: GMO Meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Holtzapple, Richard A.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Also - if you do send it, recommend running quick spell check.

Are
there briefing materials for Jim for this meeting? (Must be.) Could
you send me copy? Thx.

-----Original Message-----

From: Holtzapple,
Richard A.
Sent: Monday, June 07, 1999 1:40 PM
To: Blinken, Antony
J.; Butler, Lawrence E.
Cc: @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; McNamer,
Bruce; Sandalow, David B.
Subject: GMO Meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]

Tony/Larry
- take a look at this and see if you think it is helpful for Jim
in preparing for today's meeting.

FOR JIM FROM TONY BLINKEN/RICKHOLTZAPPLE:

We
wanted to provide some additional thoughts on ways forward on the
GMO issue prior to this afternoon's meeting. State called today
to say that they had heard Senator Ashcroft is planning to move ahead
with a resolution calling for the G-8 Summit to address the issue
of GMO's. We expect that at today's meeting State will push the
proposal that we consider agreeing to a G-8 Working Group, modeled
on the Climate Change Working Group, to address this issue.

There
may be merit to this idea. One of the problems we have with the
Europeans on biotech foods and agriculture is that they continually

portray the U.S. as unconcerned about the dangers and unwilling to listen. A Working Group, if properly constituted, could both demonstrate that we are prepared to engage on the issues and provide a forum for explaining the science and procedures behind our handling of these same issues.

Our tactic of pushing to keep this work in the appropriate fora (such as the Codex or the Convention on BioDiversity) helps keep the focus on science, but they are not able to respond in a timely way to developments. One outcome we definitely seek to avoid is being in a situation where our primary method of response will be to take restrictive measures placed on GMOs to the WTO. We should win these cases, but at considerable political cost.

Thus, our objective in such a Working Group would be in applying science more effectively to what is becoming an increasingly political debate. A Working Group could help provide a forum:

- where the various sides can exchange information on both the political pressures on their policies as well as the science backing up (or in the case of the Europeans, not backing up) their positions;
- where higher-level policy-makers would become more familiar with the scientific issues in question.

Some factors to consider if we were to pursue this approach:

- . what would be the scope of the WG's work would be (issues related to the Biosafety Protocol negotiations, the Codex talks, and what else?)
- the WG must be informal enough to avoid undermining the institutions involved, such as the WTO and Codex.
- what participation would help assure the right balance of political and science issues -- we assume the group would need representation from the Foreign, Trade, Environment and Agriculture Ministries, but should we also include science advisors.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/7/99 1:56:16 PM
FROM Blinken, Antony J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: GMO Meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Holtzapple, Richard A.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

great. a few suggested edits.

-----Original Message-----

From: Holtzapple,
Richard A.
Sent: Monday, June 07, 1999 1:40 PM
To: Blinken, Antony
J.; Butler, Lawrence E.
Cc: @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; McNamer,
Bruce; Sandalow, David B.
Subject: GMO Meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]

Tony/Larry

- take a look at this and see if you think it is helpful for Jim
in preparing for today's meeting.

FOR JIM FROM TONY BLINKEN/RICKHOLTZAPPLE:

We

wanted to provide some additional thoughts on ways forward on the
GMO issue prior to this afternoon's meeting. State called today
to say that they had heard Senator Ashcroft is planning to move ahead
with a resolution calling for the G-8 Summit to address the issue.
[of GMO's.] We expect that at today's meeting State will push the
proposal that we consider agreeing to a G-8 Working Group, modeled
on the Climate Change Working Group, as a way to move forward. [to
address this issue.]

There may be merit to this idea. One of
the problems we have with the Europeans on biotech foods and agriculture
is that they continually portray the U.S. as unconcerned about the
dangers and unwilling to listen. A Working Group, if properly constituted,
could both demonstrate that we are prepared to engage on the issues
and provide a forum for explaining the science and procedures behind

our handling of these same issues.

To date, we have sought [Our tactic of pushing] to keep this work in the appropriate fora (such as the Codex or the Convention on BioDiversity) in order [helps] to keep the focus on science, but they [? who is they? the fora?] are not able to respond in a timely way to developments. At the same time, [One outcome we definitely seek to] we should avoid [is] being in a situation where our primary method of response will be to take restrictive measures placed on GMOs to the WTO. We should win these cases, but at considerable political cost.

Thus, our objective in such a Working Group would be to [in] apply[ing] science more effectively to what is becoming an increasingly political debate. A Working Group could help provide a forum:

- where the various sides can exchange information on both the political pressures on their policies as well as the science backing up (or in the case of the Europeans, not backing up) their positions;
- where higher-level policy-makers would become more familiar with the scientific issues in question.

Some factors to consider if we were to pursue this approach:

- . what would be the scope of the WG's work would be (issues related to the Biosafety Protocol negotiations, the Codex talks, and what else?)
- the WG must be informal enough to avoid undermining the institutions involved, such as the WTO and Codex.
- what participation would help assure the right balance of political and science issues -- we assume the group would need representation from the Foreign, Trade, Environment and Agriculture Ministries, but should we also include science advisors.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/7/99 2:11:20 PM
FROM Hachigian, Nina L.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: GMO note [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Blinken, Antony J.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY fab

-----Original Message-----

From: Blinken, Antony J.

Sent: Monday,
June 07, 1999 1:58 PM

To: Hachigian, Nina L.

Subject: GMO note
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Rick is working a note with me for Jim. Should
have imminently.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/7/99 6:35:51 PM
FROM Shapiro, Daniel B.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: GMO Meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Rudman, Mara E.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Thanks. This one looks like a winner.

-----Original Message-----

From: Rudman,
Mara E.
Sent: Monday, June 07, 1999 5:55 PM
To: @LEGISLAT - Legislative
Affairs
Subject: FW: GMO Meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]

I have NO IDEA
what this issue involves, but note the reference to Ashcroft and
a resolution, which is why I'm forwarding...

-----Original Message-----

From: Holtzapple,
Richard A.
Sent: Monday, June 07, 1999 2:12 PM
To: @NSA - Natl
Security Advisor
Cc: @EUROPE - European Affairs; Sandalow, David
B.; @INTECON - Economic Affairs
Subject: FW: GMO Meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]

FOR
JIM FROM TONY BLINKEN/RICKHOLTZAPPLE:

We wanted to provide some
additional thoughts on ways forward on the GMO issue prior to this
afternoon's meeting. State called today to say that they had heard
Senator Ashcroft is planning to move ahead with a resolution calling
for the G-8 Summit to address the issue. We expect that at today's
meeting State will push the proposal that we consider agreeing to
a G-8 Working Group, modeled on the Climate Change Working Group,
as a way to move forward.

There may be merit to this idea. One of the problems we have with the Europeans on biotech foods and agriculture is that they continually portray the U.S. as unconcerned about the dangers and unwilling to listen. A Working Group, if properly constituted, could both demonstrate that we are prepared to engage on the issues and provide a forum for explaining the science and procedures behind our handling of these same issues.

To date, we have sought to keep this work in the appropriate fora (such as the Codex or the Convention on BioDiversity) in order to keep the focus on science, but these fora are not able to respond in a timely way to developments. At the same time, we should avoid being in a situation where our primary method of response will be to take restrictive measures placed on GMOs to the WTO. We should win these cases, but at considerable political cost.

Thus, our objective in such a Working Group would be to apply science more effectively to what is becoming an increasingly political debate. A Working Group could help provide a forum:

- where the various sides can exchange information on both the political pressures on their policies as well as the science backing up (or in the case of the Europeans, not backing up) their positions;

- where higher-level policy-makers would become more familiar with the scientific issues in question.

Some factors to consider if we were to pursue this approach:

- . what would be the scope of the WG's work would be (issues related to the Biosafety Protocol negotiations, the Codex talks, and what else?)

- what USG resources (including time of senior policy-makers) would be required to make this a useful exercise?

- the WG must be informal enough to avoid undermining the institutions involved, such as the WTO and Codex.

- what participation would help assure the right balance of political and science issues -- we assume the group would need representation from the Foreign, Trade, Environment and Agriculture Ministries, but should we also include science advisors.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/8/99 11:01:51 AM
FROM McNamer, Bruce
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: GMO's? [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Butler, Lawrence E.
Holtzapple, Richard A.
Blinken, Antony J.
Sandalow, David B.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

That's about right

-----Original Message-----

From: Butler, Lawrence

E.

Sent: Monday, June 07, 1999 8:14 PM

To: Holtzapple, Richard

A.; McNamer, Bruce; Blinken, Antony J.; Sandalow, David B.

Subject: RE:

GMO's? [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Agreed with Stu Eizenstat

to make GMO discussion centerpiece of the summit. Not.

NEC/USTR

will pull together US industry types to explain why not, and how

we intend to use US-EU TEP process, plus CODEX,OECD and other friendly
fora to deal with this issue.

Bruce -- did I miss anything?

-----Original

Message-----

From: Holtzapple, Richard A.

Sent: Monday, June 07,

1999 8:00 PM

To: McNamer, Bruce; Blinken, Antony J.; Butler, Lawrence

E.; Sandalow, David B.

Subject: GMO's? [UNCLASSIFIED]

Would appreciate

a brief read-out from any of you who may have been at the meeting as to any outcomes (particularly those that may have an impact on G-8 Summit). thanks.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/14/99 2:23:11 PM
FROM Hammonds, D. Holly
CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
CLASSIFICATIONREASON 1.5(e)
DATECLASSIFIEDON 06/14/1999
DECLASSIFYON 06/14/2009
SUBJECT GMO'S: RAISING THE ISSUE WITH THE PRESIDENT AND
[CONFIDENTIAL]
TO Sandalow, David B.
CARBON_COPY
TEXT_BODY FYI.

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526, Sec. 3.5 (b)
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By me NARA, Date 11/26/2019
7516-0524-m (3.19)

-----Original Message-----

From: WHSR
Sent: Monday, June
14, 1999 1:18 PM
To: Blinken, Antony J.; Davidson, Leslie K.; Gordon,
Philip H.;
Hammonds, D. Holly; Holtzapple, Richard A.; Lee, Malcolm
R.; Moyn,
Samuel A.; Schaefer, Matthew P.; Wechsler, William F.
Subject:
GMO'S: RAISING THE ISSUE WITH THE PRESIDENT AND

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SECTION 01 OF 02 PARIS 011314

FOR THE PRESIDENT,
VICE PRESIDENT, SECRETARY OF
AGRICULTURE AND U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE
FROM THE
AMBASSADOR

STATE PASS AGRICULTURE FOR SECRETARY GLICKMAN
AND
FAS/OA/GALVIN
STATE PASS USTR FOR BARSHEFSKY, SCHER AND MURPHY

STATE
PASS FDA FOR COMMISSIONER
STATE FOR UNDER SECRETARY EIZENSTAT AND
A/S LARSON
RIGA FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY GROSSMAN

E.O. 12958:
6/14/04
TAGS: EAGR, ETRD, PREL, FR, EUN
SUBJECT: GMO'S: RAISING
THE ISSUE WITH THE PRESIDENT AND
PRIME MINISTER

CLASSIFIED BY
AMBASSADOR FELIX ROHATYN FOR REASONS 1.5 B
AND D.

REF: (A) PARIS
10706; (B) PARIS 8090; (C) PARIS 6984;
(D) PARIS 6774

1. ~~(C)~~
SUMMARY AND COMMENT. SENIOR FRENCH LEADERS ARE
TAKING AN INCREASINGLY
HOSTILE PUBLIC LINE ON GMO'S. BOTH
PRESIDENT CHIRAC AND PRIME MINISTER
JOSPIN SEE DOMESTIC
POLITICAL ADVANTAGE IN AN ANTI-GMO APPROACH.
WE SHOULD DO
OUR BEST TO ENGAGE THEM ON THIS ISSUE IN A RATIONAL,
COOPERATIVE
MANNER -- AND DO IT QUICKLY, BEFORE THEY ARE
COMPLETELY LOCKED INTO
POSITIONS THAT WILL FORCE US INTO A
MAJOR TRADE DISPUTE. RE-ENGAGING
WITH JOSPIN ON HIS
SUGGESTION LAST YEAR FOR A BILATERAL DIALOGUE
COULD BE ONE
MEANS OF MOVING THE ISSUE FORWARD IN A POSITIVE WAY.

END
SUMMARY AND COMMENT.

2. (U) THE PUBLIC STATEMENTS OF PRESIDENT
CHIRAC AND PRIME
MINISTER JOSPIN ON GMO'S HAVE BECOME INCREASINGLY
HARD
LINE IN RECENT WEEKS. IN A DISCUSSION WITH THE FRENCH
AMERICAN
BUSINESS COUNCIL OF PROMINENT CEO'S ON JUNE 11,

PRESIDENT CHIRAC
SAID THAT THERE WOULD BE "ABSOLUTE
PROTECTION" ON MATTERS OF FOOD
SAFETY AND THAT FRANCE AND
EUROPE WOULD ACCEPT NO GMO'S OR BEEF
RAISED WITH HORMONES.
CHIRAC STATED THAT THE WTO HAS NO JURISDICTION
ON MATTERS
OF HEALTH. IN HIS SPEECH TO THE BUSINESS COUNCIL,
PRIME
MINISTER
JOSPIN STATED THAT EUROPEANS ARE DEMANDING STRICT
CRITERIA FOR SCIENTIFIC
ANALYSIS OF HEALTH RISKS. HE SAID
"WE MUST REFRAIN FROM FORCING
THE ISSUES AND RESIST THE
TEMPTATION TO ACT UNILATERALLY WITH INCONSIDERATE
RUTHLESSNESS
THAT WILL PROVE HARMFUL IN BOTH THE SHORT AND
LONG TERM. IT IS
UP TO GOVERNMENTS AND BUSINESS TO ENGAGE
IN DIALOGUE WITH CITIZENS
AND CONSUMERS TO FIND A
CONSENSUS THAT RECONCILES BUSINESS INTERESTS
WITH THE
DEMANDS OF OUR CONSUMERS AND CITIZENS."

3. (U) DANIEL
COHN-BENDIT, HAVING HELPED JOSPIN'S
COALITION-PARTNER GREENS WIN
A STRONG 9 PERCENT OF THE
FRENCH VOTE IN THE JUST-COMPLETED EUROPEAN
ELECTIONS,
STATED THAT THE GREENS WOULD PUSH FOR A
MORATORIUM ON
ALL
GMO'S. (SEE REF A FOR FRENCH ENVIRONMENT MINISTER
VOYNET'S
SIMILAR STATEMENT SEVERAL WEEKS AGO.)

4. ~~(C)~~ SENATOR PAT ROBERTS
OF KANSAS REPORTED TO ME THAT A
GROUP OF FRENCH FARM LEADERS TOLD
HIM THEY WERE VERY MUCH
OPPOSED TO ACCEPTING GMO'S. I MET THE SAME
STRONG
ANTIPATHY ON THIS ISSUE SEVERAL WEEKS AGO FROM
SIMILAR
FARM
LEADERS. FRENCH POLITICIANS, FOOD DISTRIBUTORS AND

CONSUMER GROUPS
HAVE BEEN TELLING US THAT NON-ACCEPTANCE
OF GMO'S IS A MATTER OF
CULTURE NOT SCIENCE. SECRETARY
DALEY, WHO ATTENDED THE BUSINESS
COUNCIL MEETINGS AND
HEARD THE LEVEL OF FRENCH OPPOSITION TOLD ME
HE HAS SENT A
MEMO ON GMO'S TO SANDY BERGER AND GENE SPERLING.
SENATOR
ROBERTS TOLD ME HE WILL TALK TO SECRETARY GLICKMAN
ABOUT
BRINGING
CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS TO FRANCE WHEN HE VISITS AT
THE END OF THE
MONTH. HE SAID THAT THIS IS AN ISSUE
CONGRESS WILL HAVE TO ENGAGE
ON WITH THE FRENCH.

5. ~~(C)~~ WE ARE HEARING THAT CHIRAC WILL RAISE
THE ISSUE OF
GMO'S AT THE G8 SUMMIT. HE THINKS THE ISSUE IS A
POLITICAL
WINNER FOR HIM. HIS PARTY AND THE CENTER-RIGHT
GENERALLY DID POORLY
IN THE EUROPEAN ELECTIONS. HE WILL
THEREFORE DO WHATEVER HE CAN
TO TRY TO SOLIDIFY HIS
TRADITIONAL SUPPORT FROM RURAL FRANCE. HE
WILL VIEW
OPPOSING GMO'S AS A TACTIC FOR HIM TO REACH OUT TO
DISAFFECTED
VOTERS, SUCH AS THOSE WHO GAVE THE FISHING AND
HUNTING PARTY A SURPRISING
6.5 PER CENT OF THE VOTE. WE
ARE ALSO TOLD THAT CHIRAC PERSONALLY
IS VERY MUCH OPPOSED
TO GMO'S.

6. ~~(C)~~ THE FRENCH PUBLIC'S CONFIDENCE
IN SCIENCE AND
FRENCH AND EUROPEAN FOOD AND HEALTH SAFETY
MECHANISMS
HAS
BEEN BATTERED BADLY BY THE BELGIAN DIOXIN SCARE,
THE
TAINTED
BLOOD SCANDAL TRIALS HERE AND THE MAD COW CRISIS.
I AM CONCERNED
THAT THE FRENCH LEADERSHIP APPEARS MORE

THAN WILLING TO ADOPT A
LUDDITE APPROACH TO BIO-TECHNOLOGY
IN AGRICULTURE IF THAT IS THE
POLITICALLY POPULAR OR SAFE
THING TO DO. WE URGENTLY NEED TO ENGAGE
WITH THE FRENCH
AT THE HIGHEST POLITICAL LEVEL IN ORDER TO DEVELOP
A
COOPERATIVE, RATIONAL, SCIENCE-BASED APPROACH TO
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SECTION 02 OF 02 PARIS 011314

FOR THE PRESIDENT, VICE
PRESIDENT, SECRETARY OF
AGRICULTURE AND U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE
FROM THE
AMBASSADOR

STATE PASS AGRICULTURE FOR SECRETARY GLICKMAN
AND
FAS/OA/GALVIN
STATE PASS USTR FOR BARSHEFSKY, SCHER AND MURPHY
STATE
PASS FDA FOR COMMISSIONER
STATE FOR UNDER SECRETARY EIZENSTAT AND
A/S LARSON
RIGA FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY GROSSMAN

E.O. 12958:
6/14/04
TAGS: EAGR, ETRD, PREL, FR, EUN
SUBJECT: GMO'S: RAISING
THE ISSUE WITH THE PRESIDENT AND
PRIME MINISTER

BIOTECHNOLOGY.

7.
~~(C)~~ FRANCE REMAINS POTENTIALLY OUR STRONGEST ALLY
IN
EUROPE IN THE
BIOTECHNOLOGY AREA. FRANCE IS EUROPE'S
BIGGEST AND MOST EFFICIENT
AGRICULTURAL PRODUCER. IT HAS
ALWAYS BEEN A LEADER IN USING SCIENTIFIC
ADVANCES. BUT ON
GMO'S WE RUN THE RISK OF LOSING FRENCH POLITICAL
WILL IN
THE FACE OF DETERMINED INTEREST GROUPS AND A
WORRIED

PUBLIC.

IF WE LOSE FRANCE, WE WILL LOSE EUROPE. THE
BRITISH AMBASSADOR,
AFTER HAVING HEARD CHIRAC, TOLD ME
BLUNTLY THAT "WE'LL BE AGAINST
YOU TOO."

8. ~~(C)~~ ON YOUR VISIT HERE THIS WEEK, I WOULD ENCOURAGE
YOU
TO LAY DOWN STRONG MARKERS WITH BOTH CHIRAC AND
JOSPIN ON
GMO'S.
THE PROBLEM OF PUBLIC INSECURITY ABOUT
AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SAFETY
HAS BEEN IN LARGE PART
CREATED BY EUROPE'S INADEQUATE AND POLITICALLY
CONTROLLED
SAFETY MECHANISMS. THERE IS NO EUROPEAN FDA AND
THERE
IS
UNLIKELY TO BE ONE ANYTIME SOON. WE HAVE TO WORK
WITH
WHAT
EXISTS HERE NOW.

9. ~~(C)~~ I WOULD TELL CHIRAC AND JOSPIN THAT WE
WANT TO WORK
WITH THEM. OUR GOAL IS A COOPERATIVE DIALOGUE TO
ENCOURAGE
PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF SAFE NEW TECHNOLOGIES. IT
WAS JOSPIN WHO SUGGESTED
TO YOU LAST YEAR THAT WE PURSUE A
BILATERAL SCIENTIFIC DIALOGUE.
WHEN WE RESPONDED
POSITIVELY THE FRENCH LET THE MATTER DROP. USTR
BARSHEFSKY
RECENTLY RAISED THE SUGGESTION AGAIN WITH THE
FRENCH FINANCE MINISTER.
YOU SHOULD TELL JOSPIN THAT SUCH
AN APPROACH IS NEEDED SO THAT
WE CAN MOVE FORWARD
TOGETHER.

10. ~~(C)~~ YOU MIGHT TELL CHIRAC HOW
SURPRISED YOU WERE AT
HIS STATEMENT ON THE WTO'S LACK OF JURISDICTION
ON HEALTH
SAFETY ISSUES. THAT STATEMENT WOULD CERTAINLY
APPEAR
AT

ODDS WITH OUR MUTUALLY AGREED-UPON SPS AGREEMENT
AND THE
WTO
DECISION ON BEEF RAISED WITH HORMONES. SAFETY IS ONE
THING - BOWING
TO IRRATIONAL POPULAR OPINION ANOTHER. IN
THE LONGER TERM, EUROPEAN
CONSUMERS WILL BE BETTER SERVED
BY GOVERNMENTS THAT INSIST ON USING
SCIENCE-BASED RISK
ANALYSIS.

ROHATYN

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/14/99 2:23:40 PM
 FROM Hammonds, D. Holly
 CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
 CLASSIFICATIONREASON 1.5(e)
 DATECLASSIFIEDON 06/14/1999
 DECLASSIFYON 06/14/2009
 SUBJECT GMO'S: RAISING THE ISSUE WITH THE PRESIDENT AND
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
 TO McNamer, Bruce
 CARBON_COPY
 TEXT_BODY FYI.

DECLASSIFIED
 E.O. 13526, Sec. 3.5 (b)
 White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
 By VL NARA, Date 11/16/09
 2016-0529-M (3.20)

-----Original Message-----

From: WHSR
 Sent: Monday, June
 14, 1999 1:18 PM
 To: Blinken, Antony J.; Davidson, Leslie K.; Gordon,
 Philip H.;
 Hammonds, D. Holly; Holtzapple, Richard A.; Lee, Malcolm
 R.; Moyn,
 Samuel A.; Schaefer, Matthew P.; Wechsler, William F.
 Subject:
 GMO'S: RAISING THE ISSUE WITH THE PRESIDENT AND

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SECTION 01 OF 02 PARIS 011314

FOR THE PRESIDENT,
 VICE PRESIDENT, SECRETARY OF
 AGRICULTURE AND U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE
 FROM THE
 AMBASSADOR

STATE PASS AGRICULTURE FOR SECRETARY GLICKMAN
 AND
 FAS/OA/GALVIN
 STATE PASS USTR FOR BARSHEFSKY, SCHER AND MURPHY

STATE
PASS FDA FOR COMMISSIONER
STATE FOR UNDER SECRETARY EIZENSTAT AND
A/S LARSON
RIGA FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY GROSSMAN

E.O. 12958:
6/14/04
TAGS: EAGR, ETRD, PREL, FR, EUN
SUBJECT: GMO'S: RAISING
THE ISSUE WITH THE PRESIDENT AND
PRIME MINISTER

CLASSIFIED BY
AMBASSADOR FELIX ROHATYN FOR REASONS 1.5 B
AND D.

REF: (A) PARIS
10706; (B) PARIS 8090; (C) PARIS 6984;
(D) PARIS 6774

1. (S)
SUMMARY AND COMMENT. SENIOR FRENCH LEADERS ARE
TAKING AN INCREASINGLY
HOSTILE PUBLIC LINE ON GMO'S. BOTH
PRESIDENT CHIRAC AND PRIME MINISTER
JOSPIN SEE DOMESTIC
POLITICAL ADVANTAGE IN AN ANTI-GMO APPROACH.
WE SHOULD DO
OUR BEST TO ENGAGE THEM ON THIS ISSUE IN A RATIONAL,
COOPERATIVE
MANNER -- AND DO IT QUICKLY, BEFORE THEY ARE
COMPLETELY LOCKED INTO
POSITIONS THAT WILL FORCE US INTO A
MAJOR TRADE DISPUTE. RE-ENGAGING
WITH JOSPIN ON HIS
SUGGESTION LAST YEAR FOR A BILATERAL DIALOGUE
COULD BE ONE
MEANS OF MOVING THE ISSUE FORWARD IN A POSITIVE WAY.

END
SUMMARY AND COMMENT.

2. (U) THE PUBLIC STATEMENTS OF PRESIDENT
CHIRAC AND PRIME
MINISTER JOSPIN ON GMO'S HAVE BECOME INCREASINGLY
HARD
LINE IN RECENT WEEKS. IN A DISCUSSION WITH THE FRENCH
AMERICAN
BUSINESS COUNCIL OF PROMINENT CEO'S ON JUNE 11,

PRESIDENT CHIRAC
SAID THAT THERE WOULD BE "ABSOLUTE
PROTECTION" ON MATTERS OF FOOD
SAFETY AND THAT FRANCE AND
EUROPE WOULD ACCEPT NO GMO'S OR BEEF
RAISED WITH HORMONES.
CHIRAC STATED THAT THE WTO HAS NO JURISDICTION
ON MATTERS
OF HEALTH. IN HIS SPEECH TO THE BUSINESS COUNCIL,
PRIME
MINISTER
JOSPIN STATED THAT EUROPEANS ARE DEMANDING STRICT
CRITERIA FOR SCIENTIFIC
ANALYSIS OF HEALTH RISKS. HE SAID
"WE MUST REFRAIN FROM FORCING
THE ISSUES AND RESIST THE
TEMPTATION TO ACT UNILATERALLY WITH INCONSIDERATE
RUTHLESSNESS
THAT WILL PROVE HARMFUL IN BOTH THE SHORT AND
LONG TERM. IT IS
UP TO GOVERNMENTS AND BUSINESS TO ENGAGE
IN DIALOGUE WITH CITIZENS
AND CONSUMERS TO FIND A
CONSENSUS THAT RECONCILES BUSINESS INTERESTS
WITH THE
DEMANDS OF OUR CONSUMERS AND CITIZENS."

3. (U) DANIEL
COHN-BENDIT, HAVING HELPED JOSPIN'S
COALITION-PARTNER GREENS WIN
A STRONG 9 PERCENT OF THE
FRENCH VOTE IN THE JUST-COMPLETED EUROPEAN
ELECTIONS,
STATED THAT THE GREENS WOULD PUSH FOR A
MORATORIUM ON
ALL
GMO'S. (SEE REF A FOR FRENCH ENVIRONMENT MINISTER
VOYNET'S
SIMILAR STATEMENT SEVERAL WEEKS AGO.)

4. (C) SENATOR PAT ROBERTS
OF KANSAS REPORTED TO ME THAT A
GROUP OF FRENCH FARM LEADERS TOLD
HIM THEY WERE VERY MUCH
OPPOSED TO ACCEPTING GMO'S. I MET THE SAME
STRONG
ANTIPATHY ON THIS ISSUE SEVERAL WEEKS AGO FROM
SIMILAR
FARM
LEADERS. FRENCH POLITICIANS, FOOD DISTRIBUTORS AND

CONSUMER GROUPS
HAVE BEEN TELLING US THAT NON-ACCEPTANCE
OF GMO'S IS A MATTER OF
CULTURE NOT SCIENCE. SECRETARY
DALEY, WHO ATTENDED THE BUSINESS
COUNCIL MEETINGS AND
HEARD THE LEVEL OF FRENCH OPPOSITION TOLD ME
HE HAS SENT A
MEMO ON GMO'S TO SANDY BERGER AND GENE SPERLING.
SENATOR
ROBERTS TOLD ME HE WILL TALK TO SECRETARY GLICKMAN
ABOUT
BRINGING
CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS TO FRANCE WHEN HE VISITS AT
THE END OF THE
MONTH. HE SAID THAT THIS IS AN ISSUE
CONGRESS WILL HAVE TO ENGAGE
ON WITH THE FRENCH.

5. (C) WE ARE HEARING THAT CHIRAC WILL RAISE
THE ISSUE OF
GMO'S AT THE G8 SUMMIT. HE THINKS THE ISSUE IS A
POLITICAL
WINNER FOR HIM. HIS PARTY AND THE CENTER-RIGHT
GENERALLY DID POORLY
IN THE EUROPEAN ELECTIONS. HE WILL
THEREFORE DO WHATEVER HE CAN
TO TRY TO SOLIDIFY HIS
TRADITIONAL SUPPORT FROM RURAL FRANCE. HE
WILL VIEW
OPPOSING GMO'S AS A TACTIC FOR HIM TO REACH OUT TO
DISAFFECTED
VOTERS, SUCH AS THOSE WHO GAVE THE FISHING AND
HUNTING PARTY A SURPRISING
6.5 PER CENT OF THE VOTE. WE
ARE ALSO TOLD THAT CHIRAC PERSONALLY
IS VERY MUCH OPPOSED
TO GMO'S.

6. (C) THE FRENCH PUBLIC'S CONFIDENCE
IN SCIENCE AND
FRENCH AND EUROPEAN FOOD AND HEALTH SAFETY
MECHANISMS
HAS
BEEN BATTERED BADLY BY THE BELGIAN DIOXIN SCARE,
THE
TAINTED
BLOOD SCANDAL TRIALS HERE AND THE MAD COW CRISIS.
I AM CONCERNED
THAT THE FRENCH LEADERSHIP APPEARS MORE

THAN WILLING TO ADOPT A
LUDDITE APPROACH TO BIO-TECHNOLOGY
IN AGRICULTURE IF THAT IS THE
POLITICALLY POPULAR OR SAFE
THING TO DO. WE URGENTLY NEED TO ENGAGE
WITH THE FRENCH
AT THE HIGHEST POLITICAL LEVEL IN ORDER TO DEVELOP
A
COOPERATIVE, RATIONAL, SCIENCE-BASED APPROACH TO
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SECTION 02 OF 02 PARIS 011314

FOR THE PRESIDENT, VICE
PRESIDENT, SECRETARY OF
AGRICULTURE AND U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE
FROM THE
AMBASSADOR

STATE PASS AGRICULTURE FOR SECRETARY GLICKMAN
AND
FAS/OA/GALVIN
STATE PASS USTR FOR BARSHEFSKY, SCHER AND MURPHY
STATE
PASS FDA FOR COMMISSIONER
STATE FOR UNDER SECRETARY EIZENSTAT AND
A/S LARSON
RIGA FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY GROSSMAN

E.O. 12958:
6/14/04
TAGS: EAGR, ETRD, PREL, FR, EUN
SUBJECT: GMO'S: RAISING
THE ISSUE WITH THE PRESIDENT AND
PRIME MINISTER

BIOTECHNOLOGY.

7.
(C) FRANCE REMAINS POTENTIALLY OUR STRONGEST ALLY
IN
EUROPE IN THE
BIOTECHNOLOGY AREA. FRANCE IS EUROPE'S
BIGGEST AND MOST EFFICIENT
AGRICULTURAL PRODUCER. IT HAS
ALWAYS BEEN A LEADER IN USING SCIENTIFIC
ADVANCES. BUT ON
GMO'S WE RUN THE RISK OF LOSING FRENCH POLITICAL
WILL IN
THE FACE OF DETERMINED INTEREST GROUPS AND A
WORRIED

PUBLIC.

IF WE LOSE FRANCE, WE WILL LOSE EUROPE. THE
BRITISH AMBASSADOR,
AFTER HAVING HEARD CHIRAC, TOLD ME
BLUNTLY THAT "WE'LL BE AGAINST
YOU TOO."

8. ~~(C)~~ ON YOUR VISIT HERE THIS WEEK, I WOULD ENCOURAGE
YOU
TO LAY DOWN STRONG MARKERS WITH BOTH CHIRAC AND
JOSPIN ON
GMO'S.
THE PROBLEM OF PUBLIC INSECURITY ABOUT
AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SAFETY
HAS BEEN IN LARGE PART
CREATED BY EUROPE'S INADEQUATE AND POLITICALLY
CONTROLLED
SAFETY MECHANISMS. THERE IS NO EUROPEAN FDA AND
THERE
IS
UNLIKELY TO BE ONE ANYTIME SOON. WE HAVE TO WORK
WITH
WHAT
EXISTS HERE NOW.

9. ~~(C)~~ I WOULD TELL CHIRAC AND JOSPIN THAT WE
WANT TO WORK
WITH THEM. OUR GOAL IS A COOPERATIVE DIALOGUE TO
ENCOURAGE
PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF SAFE NEW TECHNOLOGIES. IT
WAS JOSPIN WHO SUGGESTED
TO YOU LAST YEAR THAT WE PURSUE A
BILATERAL SCIENTIFIC DIALOGUE.
WHEN WE RESPONDED
POSITIVELY THE FRENCH LET THE MATTER DROP. USTR
BARSHEFSKY
RECENTLY RAISED THE SUGGESTION AGAIN WITH THE
FRENCH FINANCE MINISTER.
YOU SHOULD TELL JOSPIN THAT SUCH
AN APPROACH IS NEEDED SO THAT
WE CAN MOVE FORWARD
TOGETHER.

10. ~~(C)~~ YOU MIGHT TELL CHIRAC HOW
SURPRISED YOU WERE AT
HIS STATEMENT ON THE WTO'S LACK OF JURISDICTION
ON HEALTH
SAFETY ISSUES. THAT STATEMENT WOULD CERTAINLY
APPEAR
AT

ODDS WITH OUR MUTUALLY AGREED-UPON SPS AGREEMENT
AND THE
WTO
DECISION ON BEEF RAISED WITH HORMONES. SAFETY IS ONE
THING - BOWING
TO IRRATIONAL POPULAR OPINION ANOTHER. IN
THE LONGER TERM, EUROPEAN
CONSUMERS WILL BE BETTER SERVED
BY GOVERNMENTS THAT INSIST ON USING
SCIENCE-BASED RISK
ANALYSIS.

ROHATYN

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/17/99 2:44:40 PM

FROM McNamer, Bruce

CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLASSIFICATIONREASON 1.5(e)

DATECLASSIFIEDON 06/17/1999

DECLASSIFYON 06/17/2009

SUBJECT GMO Backgrounder [~~CONFIDENTIAL~~]

TO Holtzapple, Richard A.

CARBON_COPY Hammonds, D. Holly

TEXT_BODY Rick
Attached is for Lael (who is not on the system). It is two pages of general background on GMOs, which she may want to include in paper for G8. Could you please pass to her. Any of your edits would be welcome as well

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

GMO.bg.doc
BACKGROUND ON GMOs

Current controversy - Public concerns in Europe over the safety of GMOs and food safety more generally have reached close to fever pitch in the past several months, and will only exacerbate problems of market access for US exporters of biotech agricultural and food products. The EU regulatory scheme at present is slow, non-transparent and subject to political pressure, and no new GMO products have been approved there since mid-1998. US exports have been further hampered by uncertainty regarding compliance with broad new mandatory labeling requirements for foods manufactured with GMOs. The public outcry over so-called "Frankenstein foods" has, moreover, had market effects (particularly in the U.K.)

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526, Sec. 3.5 (b)
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By VL NARA, Date 11/26/09
7616-571-2 (3,21)

as an increasing number of prominent European food retailers have pledged to stop selling foods containing GMOs. These perceptions and problems have most recently been exacerbated by May release of a Cornell University study that found that nearly half of monarch butterflies died when fed on milkweed dusted with GMO Bt corn pollen. While the study results were characterized by Cornell as "preliminary" and the studies themselves have been criticized within the scientific community, the EU placed a moratorium on the import of one US Bt corn variety, and public concern was further heightened over the environmental impact of GMOs.

"Negotiating positions" - US position continues to advocate rigorous, transparent and science-based approach to GMO regulation. US supports mandatory labeling for foods whose composition has been altered or which contain allergens. Otherwise, the US supports voluntary labeling of foods so long as such labeling is "truthful and not misleading." The Europeans, and the French in particular, have pressed for a "precautionary approach" (or "precautionary principle") to regulation of GMOs, but have not defined what that approach is, or have defined it differently in different contexts. However, the "precautionary approach" is often invoked in essence to permit countries to limit or ban the importation of products based on no more than a suspicion of a threat to health or the environment, but with no scientific basis for such concern. The Europeans have pressed in a number of different fora for mandatory labeling of GMO products.

US Regulations - the US regulation of GMO seeds requires that all new seed varieties are submitted to the USDA and EPA for review, which includes extensive field tests. The US has no special food safety or labeling requirements for GMO foods. Rather, all foods (GMOs and other) are regulated on a scientific basis according to their properties and use, not according to the process that

creates them. Ten years of experience with commercialization of GMO products have shown no unique food safety risks associated with GMO foods. The US does require mandatory labeling of any foods, including GMOs, whose composition has been significantly altered or when it contains unexpected allergens.

Fora for GMO discussions - GMOs are on the agenda in over 15 international fora, including the Codex Alimentarius, the Biosafety Protocol, the OECD, and the TEP. Codex - Codex is the forum for international dialogue on food safety. While EU has attempted to promulgate its own GMO agenda (precautionary principle, mandatory labeling), we have generally been successful in the Codex promoting a science-based approach to risk-assessments. At meetings of Codex Committee on Food Labeling in April, we were similarly successful in deflecting EU calls for mandatory labeling into further work on defining standards for voluntary labeling. Biosafety Protocol - the mandate of the Biosafety Protocol to the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) was to regulate the transboundary movement of GMOs intended for deliberate release into the environment (e.g. seeds, fish for propagation, microbes for bioremediation). However, negotiations evolved (we are not a direct party to the negotiations), issues of food safety were added to agenda, and in ways extremely inimical to our interests. We were able to build a coalition (the "Miami Group") to block approval of proposed Protocol in Cartagena in February. We believe that an effective Protocol can still be implemented in a reasonable time frame if limited to its original intended purpose. OECD - Working groups focused on harmonization of regulatory oversight in biotechnology and GMO seed labeling. TEP - Biotechnology Working Group currently putting in place pilot projects for assessments of environmental impacts of GMOs. TEP also has number of other technical dialogues and working groups focused in part on GMOs

Industry position - Administration officials have met with industry officials with increasing frequency over the past year to discuss the topic of GMOs. Industry was extremely appreciative of Administration "win" in blocking implementation of Biosafety Protocol as proposed in Cartagena, and of continued efforts by USG to "fight the good fight" in the Codex, OECD and other fora where GMOs are discussed. But the growing problems of market access in Europe have been increasingly frustrating, and have increased industry calls to find some way to break the current impasse. This was manifest most recently in industry/Congressional calls for inclusion of GMOs on G8 agenda. Administration officials met with Monsanto and then with a diverse group of industry participants in the run-up to the G8 to explain that we felt the G8 was not a particularly sympathetic, and perhaps even hostile, forum for discussion of the issues, and we believe that industry representatives understood this in the end. While industry has to date been adamant in insisting (with the USG) on science-based approach to regulation and in resisting any type of labeling (with the exception of the seed manufacturers, who label their GMO products already), there may be some industry movement on the labeling issue towards more voluntary labeling (and for standards related thereto) in the future as one means of achieving greater market access.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/18/99 6:35:10 PM
FROM Butler, Lawrence E.
CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
CLASSIFICATIONREASON 1.5(d)
DATECLASSIFIEDON 06/18/1999
DECLASSIFYON 06/18/2009
SUBJECT RE: European GMO strategy ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
TO McNamer, Bruce

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526, Sec. 3.5 (b)
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By N NARA, Date 11/26/2014
2016-0524-M (1.12)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

USIS will soon cease to exist. Suggest we get State EUR/ERA and PPA to coordinate; this would help plug in diverse efforts in Netherlands, London and other places, achieve synergies. See ya when you get back.

-----Original Message-----

From: McNamer, Bruce
Sent: Friday,
June 18, 1999 6:33 PM
To: Butler, Lawrence E.
Subject: RE: European
GMO strategy ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Thanks Larry
Agree that we should
get message out to posts soliciting comments and suggestions for coordinated approach to outreach/education on GMOs. We are tentatively planning Deps Mtg on GMOs for week after next with most of that agenda
around GMOs in context of WTO Ministerial. However, we did plan brief discussion on process for coordinating outreach efforts (perhaps under USIS? thoughts on that?). Might make sense to convene at sub-DC level in advance to give Deps some concrete proposals on topic. But... I am out next week. Will follow up with you and State when I return

-----Original Message-----

From: Butler, Lawrence E.

Sent: Friday, June 18, 1999 9:43 AM

To: @INTECON - Economic Affairs
Cc: @EUROPE
- European Affairs
Subject: European GMO strategy [~~CONFIDENTIAL~~]
Importance: High

Bruce

-- this is a pretty good set of ideas from London on how to begin addressing European public perceptions of GMO issues. I think we ought to reconvene at sub-DC level an interagency group to discuss
--- goal should be a message from State, cleared interagency, commending

London, and The Hague, for their initiatives, and ask for comments and submissions in order to have a coordinated plan, instead of treating Europe purely piecemeal.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SECTION 01
OF 04 LONDON 005258

STATE PLS PASS USDA FAS

ALSO FOR USTR
STATE
FOR EB/TPP/ATT:MBRUNO

DEPT PASS EPA
USDA FOR U/S SCHUMACHER;
FAS/OA/GALVIN;
USDA ALSO FOR
FAS/ITP/SIMMONS/GRUEFF/SHEIKH/MACKE/SCHWARTZ;
ALSO
FOR FAS/CMP/DLP/REDDINGTON;
FAS/CMP/GFD/RIEMENSCHNEIDER;
FAS/OFSTS/HARBERT;
ERS/WEST/MADELL; FAA/AO/NE
GENEVA FOR USTR

E.O. 12958: DECL:
06/18/09
TAGS: SENV ETRD TBIO UK
SUBJECT: GMOS AND BIOTECHNOLOGY
- EMBASSY LONDON'S STRATEGY

REF: A) NELSEN/BRUNO EMAIL B) STATE
113313

1. CLASSIFIED BY ECONOMIC MINISTER CHARLES RIES.

REASON

1.5(B)

2.

~~(C)~~ SUMMMARY

WE FACE AN UPHILL BATTLE IN THE UK TO KEEP THE
MARKET
FOR
U.S.-APPROVED GMO PRODUCTS OPEN. THE GOVERNMENT
(HMG) IS ON
OUR
SIDE, BUT CONSUMERS ARE SCARED, AND OUR OPPONENTS IN
ENVIRONMENTAL
NGOS AND MUCH OF THE MEDIA ARE RELENTLESS IN
OPPOSITION TO TRADE
IN, OR CIRCULATION OF, GMOS. WE ARE
PREPARED TO ENGAGE IN AN ACTIVE
PUBLIC DIPLOMACY CAMPAIGN,
BUT CARE IS NEEDED IN DEVELOPING OUR
MESSAGE. THIS TELEGRAM
OUTLINES ACTIONS THAT EMBASSY LONDON PLANS
TO TAKE AND
IDENTIFIES AREAS WHERE WASHINGTON SUPPORT/GUIDANCE
IS
NEEDED. THESE INCLUDE:

-- ADDITIONAL VOLUNTARY VISITOR
GROUPS TO THE U.S. (TO MEET
WITH U.S. REGULATORS, INDUSTRY, AND
OTHER STAKEHOLDERS) :
-- GETTING MORE HIGH-LEVEL, CREDIBLE SPEAKERS
FROM THE U.S.
(INCLUDING SCIENTISTS AND USG REGULATORS); WHERE
POSSIBLE,
COMBINING THEIR PROGRAMS WITH PRESENTATIONS BY
BRITISH
SCIENTISTS
AND GMO ADVOCATES
-- LAUNCHING A HIGHER PROFILE SPEAKING PROGRAM
BY EMBASSY
REPRESENTATIVES, ARMED WITH UP-TO-DATE,
COMPREHENSIVE
MATERIAL
FROM WASHINGTON, INCLUDING POINTS OF CONTACT IN THE
U.S. FOR TECHNICAL
QUESTIONS
-- INFORMATION FROM WASHINGTON ON 'BEST PRACTICES' IN

OTHER
COUNTRIES WHERE PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS HAVE
BEEN
SUCCESSFUL

--

WASHINGTON CONSIDERATION OF CREATION OF A US/EU
BIOTECH
SCIENTISTS'
GROUP UNDER TEP AUSPICES TO ADVISE ON GMO
APPROVALS

-- GUIDANCE
FROM WASHINGTON ON POLICY ISSUES LIKE LABELING,
AND TO FRAME OUR
LOBBYING EFFORTS FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN THE
90/220 DIRECTIVE, INCLUDING
POSSIBLE PROVISIONS FOR PARALLEL
APPROVALS.

-- GUIDANCE ON HOW
THE U.S. INTENDS TO USE MULTILATERAL
INSTITUTIONS TO PROMOTE CONFIDENCE
IN GMO VARIETIES THAT ARE
APPROVED FOR MARKETING.
END SUMMARY

3.

~~(C)~~ IN THE UK WE FACE A PARTICULARLY DIFFICULT
CHALLENGE IN REGAINING
A MARKET FOR GMO FOODS AND KEEPING
OPEN THE MARKET FOR GMO FEEDS.
HMG REMAINS STRONGLY
SUPPORTIVE OF BIOTECHNOLOGY, THE SAFETY OF
GMO FOODS, AND
ARGUES THAT THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT EVIDENCE OF
ADVERSE
ENVIRONMENTAL
CONSEQUENCES FROM PLANTING GMO CROPS. BUT THE
HEARTS AND MINDS
OF MOST BRITISH CONSUMERS HAVE CLEARLY BEEN
LOST DUE TO A RELENTLESS
CAMPAIGN BY FRIENDS OF THE EARTH AND
GREENPEACE, SUPPORTED BY THE
TABLOID PRESS (COMPETING TO SELL
NEWSPAPERS) AND BY A GROWING NUMBER
OF CONSUMER GROUPS.
FACED WITH CONSUMER OPPOSITION OR CONCERN OVER
SAFETY,
NEITHER BRITISH RETAILERS NOR FOOD MANUFACTURERS
WANT TO
CARRY
GMO PRODUCTS OR USE GMO INGREDIENTS. THE MARKET IS

VIRTUALLY GONE.

4.

~~(C)~~ HMG HAS TRIED TO BRING SOME SENSE TO THE DEBATE,
AND
RESPECTED
SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS HAVE BEEN SUPPORTIVE, BUT
GOVERNMENT IS
NOT TRUSTED, AND THE 'GOOD NEWS' REPORTS BY
SCIENTIFIC GROUPS DON'T
MAKE THE FRONT PAGES. MOST RETAILERS
AND MANUFACTURERS DO NOT QUESTION
THE SAFETY OF GMO PRODUCTS,
BUT THEY ARE ALSO UNDER PRESSURE FROM
ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS
AND TELL US THAT THEY MUST RESPOND TO CONSUMER
CONCERNS AND
BUYING INTENTIONS.

WHAT CAN AN EMBASSY DO?

5.

~~(C)~~ WE UNDERSTAND THAT CONSIDERABLE THOUGHT IS
GOING
INTO THIS
ISSUE IN WASHINGTON, AND WE BENEFITTED FROM READING
REF B AND THE
EXCELLENT PAPERS PREPARED BY EB FOR INTERAGENCY
CONSIDERATION.
WE CONCUR IN THE NEED FOR A PRO-ACTIVE PUBLIC
DIPLOMACY EFFORT.
THE PROBLEM, HOWEVER, IS STRUCTURING SUCH
AN EFFORT IN AN ENVIRONMENT
WHERE GOVERNMENT (PROBABLY THE
USG AS MUCH AS HMG) IS NOT TRUSTED
BY THOSE WE ARE SEEKING TO
INFLUENCE. FURTHERMORE, WE WILL HAVE
GREAT DIFFICULTY
ARGUING SUCCESSFULLY AGAINST LABELING, WHICH PITS
US AGAINST
EU 'LAW' AND CONSUMERS' 'RIGHT-TO-KNOW'.

6. ~~(C)~~

NONETHELESS, WE CAN, AND ALREADY ARE, ENGAGING

~~CONFIDENT~~

~~1A1~~ SECTION 02 OF 04 LONDON 005258

STATE PLS PASS USDA FAS

ALSO

FOR USTR
STATE FOR EB/TPP/ATT:MBRUNO

DEPT PASS EPA
USDA FOR
U/S SCHUMACHER; FAS/OA/GALVIN;
USDA ALSO FOR
FAS/ITP/SIMMONS/GRUEFF/SHEIKH/MACKE/SCHWARTZ;
ALSO
FOR FAS/CMP/DLP/REDDINGTON;
FAS/CMP/GFD/RIEMENSCHNEIDER;
FAS/OFSTS/HARBERT;
ERS/WEST/MADELL; FAA/AO/NE
GENEVA FOR USTR

E.O. 12958: DECL:
06/18/09
TAGS: SENV ETRD TBIO UK
SUBJECT: GMOS AND BIOTECHNOLOGY
- EMBASSY LONDON'S STRATEGY

ACTIVELY ON THE ISSUE. LAST MONTH
WE SENT A 10-PERSON
VOLUNTARY VISITOR GROUP ON A ONE-WEEK PROGRAM
TO WASHINGTON
AND ST. LOUIS, AND WE HAVE JUST EXTENDED INVITATIONS
FOR A
SECOND GROUP IN SEPTEMBER, POTENTIALLY FOLLOWED BY
A THIRD
GROUP
EARLY IN THE NEW FISCAL YEAR (SUBJECT TO USIS
FUNDING).
WE ARE INCLUDING
OPEN-MINDED JOURNALISTS, SCIENTISTS,
REPRESENTATIVES OF FARMER ORGANIZATIONS,
AND GOVERNMENT
OFFICIALS IN THESE TRIPS. WE HAVE INVITED LEADERS
OF
CONSUMER AND ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS, BUT IN EVERY
CASE OUR
INVITATION
WAS DECLINED.

7. (C) WE ALSO WELCOME EXPERT SPEAKERS FROM THE
U.S. WE
AGREE COMPLETELY WITH THE SUGGESTION IN THE EB
PAPER TO
"SEIZE
EVERY HIGH-LEVEL OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS SQUARELY

CONCERNS OF CONSUMERS,"
AND WE WELCOME EFFORTS IN WASHINGTON
TO MOBILIZE SPEAKERS WITH "CREDIBILITY
ON THE SCIENTIFICALLY
PROVEN ENVIRONMENTAL, HUMAN HEALTH, AND FOOD
SAFETY BENEFITS
OF MANY GMOS." U/S LOY ADDRESSED THE GMO ISSUE
DURING HIS
JUNE 14-16 VISIT TO LONDON; SENIOR USDA OFFICIALS,
INCLUDING
DEPUTY
SECRETARY ROMINGER AND TIM GALVIN, HAVE ALSO DONE
SO;
WE HAVE APPROACHED
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT NEAL LANE TO DO
SO DURING HIS JUNE 28-30
VISIT; A SENIOR NSF OFFICIAL AGREED
DURING A RECENT VISIT TO LONDON
TO IDENTIFY POSSIBLE SPEAKERS
FROM THE UNITED STATES, AND WE ARE
WORKING WITH USIS AND FAS
ON A SPEAKING PROGRAM FOR APHIS/USDA SCIENTISTS.
BUT WE
CAN DO EVEN MORE IN THIS REGARD AND WELCOME
WASHINGTON'S
HELP
IN MAKING AVAILABLE ADDITIONAL SPEAKERS. WE COULD
USEFULLY
PROGRAM
THE SAME USDA/FAS SPEAKERS WHO RECENTLY
PARTICIPATED
IN ROUND-TABLE
DISCUSSIONS IN PARIS (PARIS 11313).

8. ~~(C)~~ WE SHOULD CONSIDER
WHETHER U.S. SPEAKERS WOULD BE
MOST EFFECTIVE IN TANDEM WITH SCIENTISTS
FROM THE UK. FAS
HAS ALREADY HAD DISCUSSIONS WITH THE BRITISH
UMBRELLA
GROUP
REPRESENTING PRO-GMO FARMER, PLANT BREEDER, AND
FEED
ASSOCIATIONS.
THEY WOULD WELCOME JOINT PUBLIC APPEARANCES
WITH U.S. AND USG EXPERTS.

9.
~~(C)~~ WE HAVE NOT YET CONSIDERED WHETHER THERE WOULD
BE

VALUE IN
EMBASSY REPRESENTATIVES SPEAKING TO THE MEDIA AND
PUBLIC GROUPS
ON THE SUBJECT. IN A SENSE, IT MAY BE
UNAVOIDABLE HOWEVER -- PUBLIC
SPEAKING INVITATIONS THAT FOCUS
ON TRADE POLICY, WTO, AND AGRICULTURE
INVARIABLY DEMAND THAT
THE BIOTECHNOLOGY ISSUE BE ADDRESSED. WHILE
WE ARE
CERTAINLY PREPARED TO SEEK OUT OPPORTUNITIES TO
ADDRESS GMO
ACCEPTANCE
HEAD-ON, WE MAY NOT HAVE SUFFICIENT EXPERTISE TO
ADDRESS ALL POSSIBLE
QUESTIONS, PARTICULARLY POINTED ONES
PLANTED BY GMO FOES. IF WASHINGTON
CAN PREPARE A SIZEABLE
INFORMATION PACKET, WHICH IS REGULARLY UPDATED
AS NEW STUDIES
AND INFORMATION BECOME AVAILABLE, WE WOULD BE
MORE
COMFORTABLE
ABOUT AN ACTIVE EMBASSY-LED SPEAKING CAMPAIGN.
WE AGREE THAT WE
HAVE A GOOD STORY TO TELL, BUT IT NEEDS TO
BE SUPPLEMENTED WITH
UP-TO-THE-DATE INFORMATION, TALKING
POINTS WHEN CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES
ARISE, AND POINTS OF CONTACT
WHEN WE GET TOUGH QUESTIONS. TO CITE
BUT TWO EXAMPLES:
OPPONENTS OF GMO CROPS HAVE ALREADY POINTED OUT
THAT CLAIMS
BY BIOTECH COMPANIES REGARDING LOWER
PESTICIDE/HERBICIDE
USE
ARE NOT INDEPENDENTLY VERIFIED BY THE USG; CAN
WASHINGTON
FIND
SCIENTIFIC GROUPS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED SUCH
INDEPENDENT
VERIFICATIONS?
SECOND, THE ADEQUACY OF FDA PROCEDURES IS
ALSO QUESTIONED, SINCE
OPPONENTS CLAIM THAT THE FDA DOES NOT
INDEPENDENTLY VERIFY COMPANY
DATA AND DOES NO SAFETY TESTS
ONCE EQUIVALENCY HAS BEEN DETERMINED.

10

~~(S)~~ WE WOULD ALSO WELCOME WASHINGTON EFFORTS TO DISSEMINATE 'BEST PRACTICE' INFORMATION ON PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS. EB'S PAPER MENTIONED THE RELATIVELY SUCCESSFUL EFFORT IN THE NETHERLANDS. CAN WE DEVELOP A RELIABLE MECHANISM IN WASHINGTON TO SHARE THIS INFORMATION WITH OTHER POSTS?

11. ~~(S)~~ WE COULD ALSO USE HELP FROM THE INDUSTRY. GMO SOY AND CORN, WHICH BECOME INGREDIENTS IN ALL SORTS OF PROCESSED FOODS, DO NOT HAVE OBVIOUS BENEFITS TO CONSUMERS. GETTING 'SEXIER' PRODUCTS ON THE MARKET SOONER RATHER THAN LATER (FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES, FOR EXAMPLE) MIGHT CATCH THE PUBLIC IMAGINATION AND AT LEAST LEAD TO A WILLINGNESS TO GIVE THE PRODUCT A TRY (ON THE PART OF BOTH CONSUMERS AND RETAILERS). WE APPRECIATE THAT SUCH PRODUCTS WILL IN MOST CASES HAVE TO BE GROWN IN THE EU OR UK, AND THAT APPROVALS FOR SUCH PRODUCTS ARE SOME TIME OFF.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SECTION 03 OF 04 LONDON 005258

STATE PLS PASS USDA
FAS

ALSO FOR USTR
STATE FOR EB/TPP/ATT:MBRUNO

DEPT PASS
EPA
USDA FOR U/S SCHUMACHER; FAS/OA/GALVIN;
USDA ALSO FOR
FAS/ITP/SIMMONS/GRUEFF/SHEIKH/MACKE/SCHWARTZ;
ALSO
FOR FAS/CMP/DLP/REDDINGTON;
FAS/CMP/GFD/RIEMENSCHNEIDER;

FAS/OFSTS/HARBERT;
ERS/WEST/MADELL; FAA/AO/NE
GENEVA FOR USTR

E.O. 12958: DECL:
06/18/09
TAGS: SENV ETRD TBIO UK
SUBJECT: GMOS AND BIOTECHNOLOGY
- EMBASSY LONDON'S STRATEGY

OUR GMO POLICY - PITFALLS AND NUANCES

12

~~(C)~~ IN ANY PUBLIC AFFAIRS CAMPAIGN, WE RECOMMEND
DOWN-
PLAYING

THE LABELING ISSUE. OUR PRIMARY PROBLEM HERE IS
CONCERN ABOUT FOOD
AND ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY. IF, IN THE
MEDIUM TERM, WE CAN REESTABLISH
CONSUMER CONFIDENCE IN THE
SAFETY OF THESE PRODUCTS, LABELING WILL
BECOME LESS IMPORTANT
(AT THE MOMENT, SUPERMARKETS IN THE UK ARE
REFUSING TO CARRY
GMO PRODUCTS).

13. ~~(C)~~ THERE MAY ALSO BE VALUE
IN DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN
FOOD SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES.
HERE, OUR OPPONENTS
HAVE SUCCESSFULLY EMPLOYED BOTH, INTERCHANGEABLY.

WHILE
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS CLEARLY INFLUENCE
DECISIONS
ABOUT
THE PLANTING OF GMO CROPS (AND THE MARKET FOR U.S.-
ORIGIN SEEDS),
THEY ARE LARGELY IRRELEVANT TO THE FOOD SAFETY
DEBATE. AND IT IS
POSSIBLE, GIVEN THE HIGH-INTENSITY, CLOSE-
QUARTER NATURE OF EUROPEAN
AGRICULTURE, THAT WE CANNOT MAKE
AS EFFECTIVE A CASE ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL
SAFETY OF GMO CROPS
AS WE CAN ON FOOD SAFETY. SHOULD WE FOCUS
ON THE LATTER, ON
THE ASSUMPTION THAT IT IS MORE IMPORTANT TO OUR
EXPORT
INTERESTS IN ANY CASE?

MAINTAINING OUR DIALOGUE WITH THE
GOVERNMENT

14. (C) WHILE OUR PRIMARY BATTLEGROUND IS THE
CONSUMER
MARKETPLACE,
WE NEED TO GET ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FROM THE
GOVERNMENT ON SOME ELEMENTS
OF THE GMO DEBATE. FIRST, WE MAY
WANT TO CREATE A TRANSATLANTIC
SCIENTISTS' GROUP PERHAPS
WITHIN THE TEP, SUCH AS IN THE TRANSATLANTIC
ENVIRONMENTAL
DIALOGUE) TO PROVIDE ADVICE ON BIOTECHNOLOGY
ISSUES.
WE HAD
THOUGHT IT MADE SENSE TO ORGANIZE SUCH A SCIENTIFIC
GROUP
WITHIN
THE TEP, YET WE SHOULD RECORD THAT THE UNIFORM
ADVICE
OF WHITEHALL
OFFICIALS TO U/S LOY WAS THAT TO PUT THE
SCIENTIFIC GROUP WITHIN
THE TEP WOULD BE SEEN TO PLACE IN
"UNDER" THE GOVERNMENT TRADE TYPES,
THEREBY VITIATING ITS
VALUE.

15. (C) A SCIENTIFIC GROUP, WHEREVER
LOCATED, COULD BE
HELPFUL IN ISOLATING OUTLYING SCIENTISTS IN THE
GMO DEBATE,
DEPOLITICIZING THE DISCUSSION, AND UNDERPINNING EU
GOVERNMENTS
THAT ARE CONCERNED ABOUT SOME OF THE NEW GMO
PRODUCTS IN THE PIPELINE.
FROM OUR PERSPECTIVE IN LONDON,
SUCH AN INITIATIVE WOULD BE WORTHWHILE,
AND WE ENCOURAGE
WASHINGTON AGENCIES TO CONSIDER SOME TYPE OF
FORMAL
PROPOSAL
TO THIS END. WE NOTE, HOWEVER, THAT SOME OF OUR
BRITISH
GOVERNMENT
COLLEAGUES ARGUE THAT EVEN SUCH A GROUP WILL BE
VIEWED WITH SUSPICION
IF IT IS CREATED AND FUNDED BY

GOVERNMENT.

16. ~~(C)~~ WE MAY ALSO WANT TO CONSIDER, IN THE MEDIUM TERM, GOVERNMENT FUNDING FOR RESEARCH ON GMO SAFETY. ANY SCIENTIFIC STUDIES AND TESTS ON GMO SAFETY WHICH ARE FUNDED BY THE INDUSTRY ARE IMMEDIATELY VIEWED WITH SUSPICION ON THIS SIDE OF THE ATLANTIC. A USG CONTRIBUTION TO A NEW FUND, MATCHED BY THE EU (THEY COULDN'T RESIST, IF ONLY TO MAINTAIN A SAY) WOULD PROVIDE RESOURCES FOR A LOT OF INDEPENDENT ECOLOGICAL STUDIES AND SAFETY TESTING. THIS WORK (AND EVEN THE ALLOCATION OF THE MONEY) COULD BE MANAGED UNDER A PEER REVIEW PROCESS BY THE TRANSATLANTIC SCIENCISTS' GROUP MENTIONED ABOVE.

17. ~~(C)~~ SECOND, WE NEED TO CONTINUE LOBBYING FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN EU DIRECTIVE 90/220. OUR POINTS ON THE LACK OF TRANSPARENCY AND UNCERTAINTIES IN THE CURRENT PROCESS HAVE GENERATED CONSIDERABLE SYMPATHY IN HMG , AND WE SHOULD BUILD UPON THAT IN AN ATTEMPT TO GAIN BRITISH SUPPORT FOR INFLUENCING THE DIRECTION OF THE NEW REGULATIONS. SOME SORT OF SIMULTANEOUS APPROVAL PROCEDURE ALSO PROBABLY MAKES SENSE, AND WE HOPE WASHINGTON WILL HAVE AN INITIATIVE IN THAT REGARD IN THE CONTEXT OF COMMENTS OF THE PROPOSED NEW REGULATIONS. WE UNDERSTAND THAT FOR U.S. INDUSTRY, TIMELINESS IN THE APPROVAL PROCESS IS ALSO IMPORTANT, BUT WE URGE CAUTION IN PRESSING TOO HARD FOR A PERIOD THAT SOME GOVERNMENTS MAY VIEW AS INADEQUATE. THE PUBLIC SENSE THAT

GMO PRODUCTS ARE BEING "RUSHED"
THROUGH REGULATORY PROCESSES
(AS LUDICROUS AS IT SEEMS IN VIEW OF
THE SLOW PACE) IS
WIDESPREAD, AND WE SHOULD AVOID STANCES THAT FEED
THIS
PRECONCEPTION. AT THE END OF THE DAY, A NEW EU
PROCESS THAT
GUARANTEES
CERTAINTY WITHIN A REASONABLE PERIOD OF TIME,
COMBINED WITH SOME
PARALLEL ACTION ON APPROVALS, IS PROBABLY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

L SECTION 04 OF 04 LONDON 005258

STATE PLS PASS USDA FAS

ALSO
FOR USTR
STATE FOR EB/TPP/ATT:MBRUNO

DEPT PASS EPA
USDA FOR
U/S SCHUMACHER; FAS/OA/GALVIN;
USDA ALSO FOR
FAS/ITP/SIMMONS/GRUEFF/SHEIKH/MACKE/SCHWARTZ;
ALSO
FOR FAS/CMP/DLP/REDDINGTON;
FAS/CMP/GFD/RIEMENSCHNEIDER;
FAS/OFSTS/HARBERT;
ERS/WEST/MADELL; FAA/AO/NE
GENEVA FOR USTR

E.O. 12958: DECL:
06/18/09
TAGS: SENV ETRD TBIO UK
SUBJECT: GMOS AND BIOTECHNOLOGY
- EMBASSY LONDON'S STRATEGY

PREFERABLE TO A VERY TIGHT TIME SCHEDULE
THAT GENERATES
RENEWED POLITICAL OPPOSITION IN SOME MEMBER STATES.

18.
(C) WHILE DOMESTIC ACCEPTANCE OF GMO PRODUCTS IS THE
EMBASSY'S
MAIN GOAL, WE ALSO WANT TO BE SUPPORTIVE OF USG
EFFORTS ON MULTILATERAL
ISSUES LIKE THE BIOSAFETY PROTOCOL.

HERE, HMG IS NOT/NOT ON OUR
SIDE, AND THERE SEEMS TO BE
LITTLE WE CAN DO IN GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT
DISCUSSIONS TO
BRING ABOUT A CHANGE IN UK VIEWS. DURING U/S LOY'S
JUNE 14-
16 VISIT WE MADE VERY LITTLE PROGRESS ON THIS SUBJECT,
AND WE
MAY SIMPLY HAVE TO HOLD FIRM IN OUR EFFORTS TO
BLOCK ACTIONS
INIMICAL
TO OUR INTERESTS AT THE MULTILATERAL LEVEL. WHILE
THE BIOSAFETY
PROTOCOL IS GENERALLY THE FOCUS POINT ON THE
ENVIRONMENTAL ANGLE,
THE FOOD SAFETY ANGLE ALSO ARISES
MULTILATERALLY - IN CODEX AND
THE WTO'S SPS. HERE WE HAVE
MORE SUPPORT WITHIN HMG, AND WE SHOULD
ENSURE THAT THE UK
DOES NOT LEAD OR SUPPORT AN EU EFFORT TO UNDERCUT
THESE TWO
ORGANIZATIONS IN THE NAME OF FOOD SAFETY.

LADER

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/23/99 4:24:29 PM
FROM Butler, Lawrence E. (EUR)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT French try to block GMO approvals in EU [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Duncan, John D.
Hammonds, D. Holly
Hendricks, Lori A.
Holtzapple, Richard A.
Lee, Malcolm R.
McNamer, Bruce
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Russ, Judith P. (ADMIN)
Schaefer, Matthew P.
Shah, Sonal R.

CARBON_COPY Blinken, Antony J. (EUR)
Braden, Susan R. (CEE)
Butler, Lawrence E. (EUR)
Flanagan, Stephen J. (CEE)
Gordon, Philip H. (EUR)
Holtzapple, Richard A.
Hurley, C. Michael (EUR)
Maxfield, Nancy H. (EUR)
Moyn, Samuel A. (EUR/INTERN)
Quinn, Mary E. (EUR)
Sapiro, Miriam E. (EUR)
Schulte, Gregory L. (EUR)

TEXT_BODY

a2196
^BC-ENVIRONMENT-GENES-FRANCE 1STLD
^FOCUS-France to ask
EU to halt approvals on GMOs
(adds results of meeting, quotes,
reaction, call for biotech
firms to be made legally responsible,
last two pars.)
PARIS (Reuters) - France said Wednesday it
would ask the
European Union to halt cultivation of new genetically
modified
(GM) organisms until rules on their use can be drafted.

But it will not change its internal policy or approval procedures for the controversial crops, the government said. As EU environment ministers prepare to meet Thursday to settle differences on the bloc's GM crop policy, France said it would ask the EU to suspend the approval process for new strains of GM crops until further regulations can be written. After a meeting between Prime Minister Lionel Jospin and the French health, environment, consumer affairs and farm ministers, the government said it would ask the EU to introduce a labeling system to identify foods produced from GM crops in response to consumer outcry. The ministers agreed to maintain France's position, meaning France will keep its approval process for new GM strains. The ministers' decision also means that some types of GM maize can still be grown in France and that GM rapeseed remains banned. Environment Minister Dominique Voynet, a member of France's Green party, said France would not support the position of the European Commission at Thursday's meeting in Luxembourg.

``The proposal of the commission... is not acceptable as it does not make any reference to traceability, which is essential to consumers, and to labelling," Voynet told reporters after the meeting with Jospin. ``We will not agree to a vote tomorrow on a text that is not satisfactory," she said. But her own Green party accused the government of ambiguity on the issue, saying it regretted France had not approved a moratorium on the cultivation and sale of GM

crops.

The EU is trying to amend legislation on releasing new GM

organisms amid growing public concern about the safety of food derived

from crops altered by biotechnology.

It also faces increasing

U.S. pressure to open its market to

GM crops grown by U.S. farmers

and marketed by U.S. life

sciences firms.

Some ministers,

including Voynet, have called for more

vigilance on GM crops after

a report from researchers at Cornell

University indicated that pollen

from a variety of GM maize

could hurt the larvae of monarch butterflies.

France authorized the cultivation of transgenic maize in 1997

but banned growing GM rapeseed amid fears that it could harm the

environment. Twelve varieties of GM maize can currently be grown

in France, according to environmental group Greenpeace.

^REUTERS

RB--

06/23/99 12:15:00