

To: Travis Kim GBJH[kim.travis@syngenta.com]
Bcc: Smith Lewis CHBS[lewis.smith@syngenta.com]
From: Breckenridge Charles USGR
Sent: Fri 5/16/2008 3:04:27 PM (UTC)
Subject: Guy et al. Study

Kim: Could you also send me the Guy et al. paper or put in the folder on the PD drive under Syngenta studies.

I thought a little about the conversation we had earlier in the week. It may be somewhat foreign to you but in the expectation of challenge by hostile lawyers, regulators and activists and should I also say, our own internal critics, the program of research we are developing has to be dead solid airtight and self-contained. To me that means that an estimate can't be used when an observation will fill the gap. An assumption cannot be made unless we have experimentally verified the assumption to be true. **What we want to do is brush aside 10 years of research by others and replace it with our own** - because we believe we can be more consistent in our approach, we can be more objective in our measurements and more exacting in our interpretation - mainly because we will employ the best people to help us.

It has been my experience in these kinds of battles that even when the company has impeccable data, the other side is more ready to accept contradictory results from a poorly conducted study by someone else. Therefore, we need impeccable data. Then we need a lot of luck.

The bottom line is now we have to think comprehensively rather than restrictively. It is better to be reigned in by the money men than it is fail the science credibility test before our peers, the larger science community and finally the judge and jurors.

See you next week.

Best Regards

CBB

Case ID: 220300429

SYNG-PQT-ATR-04186172