

Press Release, etc..eml.txt

Subject:
Press Release, etc.
From:
"Tom Beauchamp" <beauchat@georgetown.edu>
Date:
Wed, 18 Oct 2006 22:55:04 -0400
To:
"David Wegman" <David_wegman@um1.edu>, "Samet, Jonathan" <jsamet@jhspk.edu>
CC:
"Mark Cullen" <MRCULLEN@aol.com>, "Ellen Eisen" <eeisen@hsph.harvard.edu>, "Noah Seixas" <nseixas@u.washington.edu>

David and all:

I agree with what David says below. Regarding the phrase "known to be caused," I am generally skeptical that epidemiological research on this issue can, at present anyway, answer causal questions. Indeed, I am skeptical of causal language here. ("Primary uncertainty" is more my kind of thing.) However, this is not my area of expertise. Closer to my competence is the matter of how "business interests" should and should not play a role. I was on the phone today with Sol discussing a related area of business interests (namely, stopping a trial for business reasons), and I would be happy to work with any member of the Board on questions of the place of business interests.

Institutional affiliations is a standard PR tactic, but not excusable for that reason. I think we should discuss this with Robin, Sol, Nancy, and Bobby. We don't need a larger audience, unless you want to pull DuPont PR people into the discussion. No one needs to be embarrassed over it, but it should not be repeated.

This should definitely be on the agenda for next week, but not at the end of the day.

Tom

--- Original Message -----

From: David Wegman
To: Samet, Jonathan
Cc: Mark Cullen ; Ellen Eisen ; Noah Seixas ; Tom Beauchamp
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2006 10:46 AM
Subject: Re: FW: Press Release (Confidential until 230 PM OCT 17)

Jon,

First, let me say that I think it was an error for them to use our institutions and not just our names. We definitely do not represent our institutions in this work. We need to make that clear for any future releases.

As for the text, I shared your concerns with Mark (who was on the phone with DuPont pushing for "less" certainty). He indicates that this was as far as he was able to push them. There is some comfort from the fact that the information, however well hidden, is present about the adverse findings. But, the release certainly appears written to leave the impression "don't worry" and I guess we had to expect that. In our discussions it is clear that DuPont places great emphasis on the phrase "known to be caused" which I think we have to agree with. But, I think we would all wish to have had phrasing included stating more clearly something to the effect that, "...in combination with the earlier findings and given the limitations of mortality studies, the findings need to be further investigated." Granted they say they are going to follow up findings but that comes at the end of the first page (and may not be read by a journalist intent on getting 3 paragraphs at most). So...

Page 1

CONFIDENTIAL (RHODES)
CONFIDENTIAL SUBJECT TO
PROTECTIVE ORDER IN ROWE/COLES