IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS STATE OF MISSOURI The Honorable Timothy J. Boyer

JOHN	L. DURNELL,)		
	Plaintiff,)		
VS.))Cause	No.	1922-CC00221
MONSANTO COMPANY,))		
	Defendant.)		

TRIAL TRANSCRIPT

Tuesday, October 3, 2023

Volume 2A

PLAINTIFF'S OPENING STATEMENT

MR. FRAZER: Still trying to gather everything together, your Honor.

THE COURT: Take your time.

MR. FRAZER: May it please the Court.

THE COURT: When you're ready, Mr. Frazer.

MR. FRAZER: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

2.1

MR. FRAZER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

Mr. Conner introduced me briefly before. My name is Roe, R-o-e, Frazer, F-r-a-z-e-r, and I have the privilege to represent John Durnell. John, would you stand up again, please. John is the plaintiff in this case. You all met him yesterday. And John's husband is Richard Roe, R-o-e, Eaton. We have the same middle name. I go by Roe; he goes by Richard. Who would have thought that?

I want to echo what Mr. Conner said yesterday. Thank you for your service. I've been doing this too long. My 39th year. And I've been doing what I'm doing here in this courtroom for that long, and I never ever fail to get excited about a trial.

It's exciting even though we, as lawyers, have gone back and forth for a few years on the case.

You just never know what's going to happen in a jury trial. You never what the Court's going to do.

You never know what the proof's going to be. We know a lot, but not all. It makes it a little exciting. I actually get a little tingle, quite frankly. It's kind of fun, even at my age. I'm

almost 65.

2.1

My -- I have the distinct honor of my son, who is back here, he practices law with me. First time he was in a courtroom -- raise your hand Trey. First time he was in a courtroom, we tried the case, I thought I did really good that day. We got home, he's about eight years old, asked him around the dinner table, "How do you think that went?"

And his only question was, "How high is that judge's chair?" We've come a long way since then.

The lawyers you'll see at our table this whole trial. Mr. Wiley Blair who's from right here in St. Louis. He lives in downtown St. Louis.

Mr. Isaac Conner. You met Isaac yesterday. And myself. We'll be the three at the table.

You may see some other people helping us.

Grant LaBar. As you can tell, he's a real young lawyer. He's barely shaving. Elizabeth, my paralegal, and there are others that will help us throughout the trial to try to bring this case to you in a meaningful, understanding, rich kind of way. It's what we want to do. We want you to understand that evidence.

Because you're going to hear stuff that no other jury's heard before. You're going to hear a

lot of evidence, a lot of medical talk, scientific literature, internal Monsanto documents, and you're going to make a decision, when we get there, as his Honor said, when we get to do closing arguments.

2.1

I can't argue anything in my opening. I can only tell you what I expect the evidence to show. We save the arguments until the end of the case, just like his Honor has told you. So I really can't argue. I want to argue things right now, but I can't.

This is a civil court system. I've tried cases in probably 22 states in a lot of courthouses across the country. I'm from Nashville. You can tell I have a bigger twang than Isaac has because I grew up in Western Kentucky, not too far from here. Was a Cardinals fan growing up, KMOX Radio.

But every time I'm in a courtroom, a new courtroom -- this is the first time I've been in the City of St. Louis courtroom. And it's a civil court system. You walk in, and even outside, you see symbols of justice; right?

And you see things. I took pictures of all of them. I wrote this one down. Right there carved in the limestone, "Let justice be done though the heavens fall." Let justice be down though the

heavens fall.

2.1

Then I walked in the courtroom and I looked right over the door right there, you see the scales of justice. And as Mr. Conner told you in a civil case, and as the judge will instruct you at the end of this case, we have to prove to you our case by what's called a preponderance of the evidence. Not beyond a reasonable doubt.

And Mr. Conner told you, you know, the scales are equal, and we put another piece of paper or something else on the scale that tips in our favor slightly to 51 percent, then you're duty bound, in your opinion, to render a verdict for the plaintiff.

Tips the other way, you're duty bound to render a verdict in favor of the defendant.

Everybody said they're comfortable with that burden. I certainly am. I've been doing it for 39 years.

We think the evidence is not going to tip those scales. We think they're going to be slammed to the bottom on our side.

The other thing when I walked in this courtroom, I saw these -- if you look up at the ceiling here, you see the crown molding? You see

the beads that kind of look like an egg? Well, in a courtroom, those are what are called rice beads. What that means is you're supposed to render a verdict for bountiful justice. There are all kinds of these justice symbols in the courtroom. Quite frankly, it's exciting to see that. A lot of modern courtrooms don't have those kind of symbols. That's what we've got here in St. Louis.

2.1

One thing I want you to know is John Durnell, this is his only time he ever gets to bat. He just gets to bat one time. If he wins, he wins. If he loses, he loses. If he hits a home run, he hits a home run. If he strikes out, he strikes out. That's it.

And I want you to know that Mr. John Durnell has put his trust in this whole civil justice system by having the guts to do what he's doing.

Now, as you all heard yesterday, John Durnell has got a lot of guts. He's a tough guy, quite frankly. His life has been one of choices. And if you think about this case when you're hearing the proof, that's what the case is about. It's about choices, choices were made right here in St. Louis.

And it's also about another word, freedom. Choices and freedom. That's what our proof is

going to be about.

2.1

Mr. Durnell, John, made choices. Monsanto made choices. John Durnell's choice to use Roundup, we believe the evidence is going to show, caused or contributed to cause his non-Hodgkin's lymphoma cancer.

Monsanto's choice to not do what they should have done, to not follow the do-right rule, to not follow their own code of conduct -- you're going to see what they said they were going to do -- resulted in billions of dollars. Choices.

Freedom.

John Durnell made certain decisions that arguably were against his own personal freedom. He chose to fall in love with Richard Eaton at a time long ago where that was looked down at, just like other things in our society are looked down at because they came up too early.

But he made a choice to do that. He fought everything. He fought against the tide on that forever to the point where he also made a choice to move into the Soulard neighborhood before it was really a neighborhood even. He made that choice.

He chose to join the Soulard beautification committee. They're all volunteers. He made that

choice.

2.1

He chose to join the United Methodist Church where he and his husband are members today.

Richard is a layman in the church. Go right there to the United Methodist Church in Lafayette Park, not too far from where they live.

And one day, John Durnell was having some pain in his groin, felt a knot. He went to the doctor. He got the news: Cancer. He had -- he thought he had a hernia is what it felt like it was in his groin.

He goes to his doctor. You'll hear him testify about it. He -- and everybody that gets a diagnosis of cancer remembers it all their life. The first words that ring out true is: I'm sorry to tell you this, but you've got cancer.

So he made another choice. He chose to do everything his doctor told him to do. And not all patients do that.

He minded his doctor, which seems like an easy choice, but it's not always an easy choice to people. He minded his doctor. He went through chemotherapy. And because he minded his doctor and made a choice to follow his doctor's instructions, he got to ring the bell when he finished his last

chemotherapy.

2.1

Now, I don't know if any of you all been in a chemotherapy situation, but when it's your last day, you get to ring a bell that you're done, at least with that course.

And that's designed so that that choice or anything in your mind about that day you got cancer, you now have a new bell rung in your head. You go forward.

John Durnell is currently in what's called remission. Okay. Remission doesn't mean cure. There's no cure for non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. None. Zero.

He's got to go to the doctor every six months. His veins have become so depressed that he has to have a port, he chose, he made another choice, he chose to have a port put in permanently so his blood could be taken easily, so he wouldn't get stuck four or five times while trying to find the vein. He made that choice.

He chose to use Roundup. You're going to hear about that. We've got his old Roundup bottles. We know where he bought it from. We know where he sprayed it. We know when he started.

About 1996, '97, he started in that

neighborhood. He started taking it back, because there were weeds everywhere.

2.1

Imagine going to a neighborhood that's been derelict for years, and then he made a decision, he made a choice to keep that beautified because he wanted the neighborhood to grow, and it did. It's been brought back to life. It's like a crocus in the wilderness that has bloomed in the dessert. It's amazing, really, what's gone on. And it's a lot because of this man here. And his husband, Richard, is also active in the Soulard district.

Those are some of the choices he made.

You might say, well, why did he choose to use Roundup? Why use Roundup?

Well, he was told by somebody, he's going to testify, he doesn't remember who, that was he was out there pulling weeds. He said somebody came up and say, "Hey, man, you might want to try this Roundup stuff so you don't have to pull weeds."

So he goes to the store, Ace Hardware, right there where he lives, starts buying Roundup. Sure enough, it works. It works.

We don't contest that Roundup kills weeds.

It's a lethal weed killer. From a weed-killing

perspective, Monsanto made an outstanding product.

From a human exposure standpoint, they also made a lethal product. That's what this evidence is going to show.

2.1

Choices. Monsanto, they started right here in St. Louis. Monsanto actually means holy mountain. They had their corporate headquarters here in St. Louis City until about 1957. They moved out to Creve Coeur. They put most of their industrial production across the river over there in East St. Louis. Sauget.

In fact, Sauget used to be called Monsanto, used to be called Monsanto Township, till the mayor of Sauget, whose name was Sauget, changed it to Sauget, like politicians will do.

They made decisions to make this stuff,

Roundup. You're going to see documents that start
in the 1970s, okay, when I was in -- how old was I
back then? When I was in 6th, 7th, 8th grade.

You'll see them, because they got the funny-looking
Courier font that nobody of uses anymore. That
started back in the '70s.

So they get to market with Roundup in 1974, '75, somewhere around that frame. And they use a -- they use a study.

You can't just put a weed killer on the

market, even though the EPA had just come into existence. You all got to think back. The EPA didn't come into existence until the Richard Nixon Administration. All right.

2.1

It wasn't like today's EPA that's everywhere and has regional offices and all that kind of stuff. But they had to show the EPA that this new product, called Roundup, that had an effective ingredient called glyphosate was okay to use.

And what do you do to figure that out? You'll learn that they can't do human studies. Because pesticides and herbicides and fungicides shouldn't ever be sprayed on a human being.

So the government won't even let you test living human beings, like they do in a pharmaceutical drug study. No. For a pharmaceutical drug to get on the market, the FDA requires a pharmaceutical company to do a clinical trial, multiple clinical trials on real human beings before that can ever go to market. Two different things here.

So the EPA, on the basis of a study that

Monsanto contracted out to a lab called Industrial

Bio-Test, IBT -- remember that, IBT. And when you

hear that you're thinking 1971, '2, all the way to

1983, '84. This product's been out there a long time. We got to talk about a lot of stuff.

So they get on the market because their IBT chronic carcinogenicity -- I can't say that word very well -- study on mice said, hey, it doesn't get in and harm mice, so you all put it on the market. Prove it doesn't harm humans. If you prove it doesn't harm mice on a long-term basis, that's where they're looking for any evidence of tumors, cancer, that sort of thing. Not short thing. That's called acute. Got a lot of acute studies to talk about. Don't worry about that. We're not talking about acute. We're talking about chronic, something that happens over a long period of time.

So on the basis of that one mouse study that IBT did, boom, Roundup's on the market. And, man, it takes off. It's a heck of a product. And it takes Monsanto to places it's never been before, from an economic standpoint, very quickly.

But in 1983, because of an investigation of IBT, every study that IBT did, including that one, was thrown out. They not only did studies for the EPA products, they had done studies for the FDA. And men went to jail at IBT.

So now Monsanto doesn't have that study. So what do they do? Golly, we've been selling this stuff for almost ten years and now we don't have a study. We can't show that it has no chronic long-term carcinogenic effects on mice or tumors. What are we going to do? Well, let's hire another lab to do a study. So they do. And the study comes out. It's given to

And the study comes out. It's given to

Monsanto privately first. These studies go to

Monsanto first. They look at them. If they like
them, great. If they don't, they do something else
with them.

So they look at the study from two men called Knezevich -- starts with a K, you'll see that -- and Hogan. And the study that they got shows -- so they exposed the rodents to glyphosate only, not Roundup. That's an important point.

And they do a control group. So some of the -- as you all probably know, some of the rodents don't get glyphosate. They get a placebo with water, whatever. And in a control group, no tumors over this long study.

In the noncontrol group, they see tumors. 640 percent increase in tumors in the exposed rodents. 640.

What does Monsanto do? They can't -- they can't -- they've got that study. They know that the first study has been thrown out, that the product has been on the market for ten years. They start scrambling. They hire a guy named Dr. Marvin Kuschner. His name may not be Marvin, by the way, that's just what I remember. But his name is Kuschner, K-u-s-c-h-n-e-r. He's a pathologist. They hired other pathologists too.

But they liked what Dr. Kuschner said, because guess what Dr. Kuschner did? He went back and looked at the pathology, and guess what he found? What would you have to find to invalidate the study? You would have to have someone find a tumor in the control group, the placebo group. And that's what Dr. Kuschner did.

So Monsanto, very proudly, took Dr. Kuschner's work back to the EPA and said: Look what we got.

The EPA scientists looked at it, they re-examined the tissue slide and said: We don't see what Dr. Kuschner sees.

And EPA ordered another study to be repeated, and for whatever reason, we don't know, Monsanto never did it. To this day. To this day.

Well, it takes cancer a long time to manifest

itself. You can put a product on the market in the '70s. You can probably expect that nothing bad's going to happen for a long time.

2.1

Think about cigarettes. You can't get cancer from smoking one cigarette one day or even a pack in a day. You got to smoke them over time. You got to be exposed over time. You've got -- your body has to react to the toxin that you're taking in every day. Your cells have to change. Your DNA changes. You're going to hear a lot of talk about that.

So you can put a product on the market and say, hey, we don't see anything here, and then wait a long time and cross your fingers. That's what Monsanto basically did. They crossed their fingers. They made that choice.

Well, independent scientists started seeing cancer. And some independent scientists -Monsanto calls these free studies, the ones they don't have to pay for. The independent scientists started seeing cancer. And they saw it in animals that they were doing their own independent studies on when they were exposed to glyphosate, that active ingredient in Roundup.

They saw it in human beings, instant rates

over time. You'll hear about some of those studies. I'm not going to bore you, going through them all. You'll hear that from our epidemiologist expert Dr. Kristan Aronson, epidemiologist from Toronto, Canada, who served on the International Agency for the Research of Cancer.

2.1

All these scientific studies started coming out. But the thing that Monsanto was concerned about the most was what was going on in a cellular level inside a human being, because that's how cancer starts.

So you get exposed to any kind of toxin, whatever it is, whatever it is, and you don't, you don't get cancer on day one; right? You get cancer over time as you keep getting exposed to it.

But what's going on inside your body at a subcellular level that you can't see, feel, doesn't hurt you, it doesn't show up in your groin, your lymph nodes don't get bigger, none of that you stuff. What's going on is your cells are getting damaged.

When the toxin gets into the blood, glyphosate, and it starts going into your cellular structure, the DNA -- ever seen a DNA strand?

They're going to show it to you on one of their

slides.

2.1

They're like little ladders, and when the rung gets broken off, what happens when you're on a real ladder, right, you got to skip that step or you're going to hit that step and you're going to fall.

And a lot of rungs start getting broken, you can't use that ladder.

And a wooden leader, it will start chipping away. Look at the jury box here. This stuff will start chipping away at the bottom of the ladder of that DNA strand. A lot of things are going on inside your body that you don't know about because you got to have a DNA test to tell you.

So Monsanto is worried about it and these studies start coming out. So they hire a guy by the name of Dr. Parry. Kind of like a parrot, P-A-R-R-Y. This guy is the top geneticist in the world.

Because if you think -- if you're making a product and you think people's chromosomes and people's DNA are being destroyed, hey, maybe we can get a geneticist to look at this. Got to have something to say it wasn't our product.

So they hire this guy Parry and they say -they give him like a test. They don't want him to

do too much work because they want to find out what he might say first.

2.1

So they give him a little test packet of four studies to review, some of these studies that have been coming out, thinking he's going to criticize the studies and, guess what, he agrees with the studies.

They start scrambling again. You're going to see. They say, "We got to turn this guy around."

Turn him around. That's what we call a 180. Turn him around.

So they give him a little bit more to do and try to cajole him a little bit. They're paying him. Dr. Parry hangs in there.

He also gives them some recommendations that they have not followed to this day, and he made those in the year 2000. 23 years ago. You'll see all that.

More studies come out. More and more. And, then all of a sudden, the International Research -- International Agency for the Research of Cancer decides they're going to have a meeting and look at glyphosate, among a couple other chemicals. That's in the year 2015. Okay.

This is a really important year. Still

talking about choices here. This is Monsanto's choices.

2.1

Before they even meet, Monsanto puts together a team on how we're going to orchestrate, quote, orchestrate outcry when they come out with a bad decision. They were predicting doom and gloom.

And in 2015, of course, the International
Agency for the Research on Cancer, which is funded
primarily by the United States of America, met and
they found glyphosate, the effective ingredient in
Roundup, to be a probable human carcinogen.
Probable human carcinogen. Based upon animal
studies, based upon cellular studies, and based
upon epidemiology. 2015.

Well, why was that so important? Because in 2016, Monsanto announced that it's selling itself to Bayer. That sale wasn't consummated until 2018 because they have to get regulatory authority all over the world to do it.

They're going to attack IARC like you can't even imagine. After IARC, 96 scientists write an article and say: We agree with everything they said.

By the way, IARC is not a nameless, faceless creature out there. It's 17 people that go to a

meeting. They get every study that's out in the public. They figure out which ones are credible, which ones aren't. Then they come to a logical conclusion based on the weight of the evidence. That's what they do.

2.1

And they don't do it in secret. They do it out in the open like in this courtroom. They meet. They talk.

Monsanto had a representative there who participated. He couldn't vote, but he participated. He wrote emails back saying, "Hey, look at what I got done today." His name is Tom Sawyer.

The U.S. EPA had a person there, a guy named Jess Rowland. Don't forget his name. You pay his salary. He wrote an email later to Monsanto saying, "If I could kill this thing, I ought to get the gold medal." If I can kill this thing, I ought to get the gold medal. That's a government employee for the EPA.

So those are the choices that were made.

What's happened since IARC? You'll hear this.

There have been multiple studies that come out that confirm everything that they've decided. And as you might imagine, there are mixed studies out

there.

2.1

But as you'll see, some of them aren't exactly what they appear to be. Be vigilant.

So that's where we are. We're going to have a -- we're going to have Dr. Aronson come in here and talk about epidemiology. She's going to lay it out there for you and she's going to get cross-examined by these lawyers over there. You'll get to judge her credibility.

We're going to have Dr. Richard Degrandchamp.

He's a toxicologist from Denver. He's going to

tell you how -- what animal and what cellular

studies are out there and what they mean. He's a

toxicologist. That's his job. He teaches.

We're going to bring Dr. Kenneth Spaeth in here. And they're going to put a slide up here in a moment, if they do it, and they're going to say, Dr. Spaeth, he's not an oncologist. He's not. He's not an expert on non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. He's not. He admits that. They know that. They've taken his deposition, multiple times. They're going to try to say he's not qualified. That's the inference they want you to get.

He's the guy that does all the occupational disease causation work for workers' comp claims for

the 9/11 disaster. If he's not qualified to give opinions on what causes cancer or disease, there's nobody in the United States that's qualified. He's picked by the government to do that. You'll hear him testify.

2.1

You're going to hear from John Durnell.

You're going to hear from Richard Eaton. And maybe
a few others.

But one you're going to hear from, and that's going to be this afternoon, going to start with her, is a lady by the name of Donna Farmer. She's very charming. She's very well-spoken. She's going to be a difficult witness for me. But we're starting with her because we're trying to get the truth to you as fast as we can. And that's my goal is to get this case over sooner rather than later, not bore you with videos and things like that to the extent we can avoid that.

So she's going to be the first witness. What you're going to hear, she was a spokesperson for Monsanto. She got picked to go on a TV show after the IARC probable human carcinogen went out. She went on a TV show to talk about Roundup.

She's been a spokesperson at many things.

She's given deposition testimony. A deposition is

where you get sworn in, you're in a room, it's just the lawyers, not the Court, but can be used in a courtroom. You might see some of that. She's been deposed multiple times as a company representative for Monsanto. She sat at counsel table a few times at trials as a corporate representative.

2.1

She's definitely written a lot of stuff to the public, to the scientists. She's interfaced with other scientists, telling the Monsanto stories.

She's been that kind of spokesperson. She spoke at conferences all over for Monsanto.

She's talked to the EPA for Monsanto. She talked internally to all the scientists for Monsanto.

But you know what? Before they ever let her go out to the public, they put her through something called media training. I don't know if anybody knows what media training is. I didn't know what it was. Media training is where you get taught how to speak, testify, make your case. I actually should take it probably; right? Might have helped me in this courtroom.

She's taken a media training course from professionals. She made handwritten notes all over her document of what to do. And we'll go through

some of those with her when she's on the stand this afternoon.

But one of the things I want you to think about is she did what's called blocking and bridging. She learned how to block and bridge.

2.1

Now, I'm going to ask her if she'll agree not to do that today here in this courtroom. But when she starts blocking and bridging, I want you to remember that media training she got. She's good.

She's also going to tell you something about

Monsanto's freedom -- remember, I said this case is

about choice and freedom -- freedom to operate.

That's what they call it.

And I was talking with my good friend here Isaac about that. He played college basketball. He was a good college basketball player at UTC Chattanooga, or UT Chattanooga. I was the worst player on a terrible team in a little NAIE school. So we always try to put things in basketball terms.

And I said -- he said, "Blocking and bridging?" He said, "Blocking?" He said, "It sounds to me like when you have the ball, you don't have any more dribbles left, you get your elbows out and you're going to start pivoting and start moving them around and swinging them and that sort

of thing."

2.1

A light went off in my head. That's what Monsanto's been doing since 1974, blocking and bridging. Block out the bad stuff. Put those elbows out, protect the ball and bridge it to somewhere else. Move the message to somewhere else. That's what that is.

You know, I have a slide show. I'm not going to even show it, I think. I want to respect your time. You'll see the documents anyway. It's a pretty good slide show anyway. But one thing you're going to hear that no jury's ever heard, you're going to hear what's really in the bottle of Roundup.

On the label they put glyphosate -- and you'll see what Mr. Durnell used. We've got the bottles. He used a lot of different kind of glyphosate, Roundup products.

By the way, a user never uses pure glyphosate. Right? There's no such thing as you're spraying pure glyphosate. You're spraying the formulated product, which is called Roundup. It's got other stuff in it. That's why I said: What's in the bottle?

And here's what he sprayed. Roundup

Ready-to-Use Plus. That means you go in the store,
you buy that bottle, it's ready to go. You don't
have to mix anything in it, you start spraying.
Roundup Ready-to-Use Extended Control. That

2.1

Roundup Ready-to-Use Extended Control. That means it's got a little more of something in there to make it last a little bit longer. Extended control.

Roundup Super Concentrate. Exactly what you think it is. It's a big concentrate made of Roundup. Because he bought a sprayer and started mixing the concentrate with water because it's less expensive. Remember, he's a volunteer. He's buying this stuff.

And then there's a Roundup Concentrate Plus he used. It's got even more glyphosate in it.

But you know what he never saw on the label?

He never saw what else was in the bottle, because

Monsanto doesn't put it on there.

They call it inert ingredients. They call it other ingredients. They call it glyphosate the effective ingredient. They'll try to tell you it's all water. And let's just start with water.

Where do they get their water? The place they manufacture it is called Luling, Louisiana.

There's another one called Muscatine, Iowa. You

get the water where you are; right? Luling,
Louisiana, is on the Mississippi River, except it's
a lot more downstream than we are here in St.
Louis.

2.1

You all know, growing up here, what goes on this area in the Mississippi River. You can imagine what it's like when it makes it down near New Orleans. So what's in the water?

Then you say, well, how do you get this stuff to spread over a leaf? Glyphosate is very effective at killing plants. You spray it on anything, it's going to kill it, get enough on it. It's effective at that, but Monsanto realized to make it more effective we need to add something so it will spread over the whole leaf, the whole skin.

Believe it or not, a plant has skin, kind of like we do. It has a protective waxy layer so when something hits it, it tends to be repelled, kind of like our skin the.

So they added what's called a surfactant, s-u-r-f-a-c-t-a-n-t. Surfactant. They're going to tell you all, oh, that stuff, it's like baby shampoo. No, no, no, no.

The surfactant they used had a chemical in it called 1,4-dioxane. It's a known human carcinogen.

Roundup has arsenic in it. I don't think I have to tell anybody what arsenic is. You know it's a poison. It's also a carcinogen.

2.1

When it was exposed to water, let's say you're using a super concentrate or concentrate, if the water has sulfites in it, which we're in St. Louis, sulfites combine with what's in the Roundup bottle make a chemical called NNG. Guess what? It's a human carcinogen.

We'll look at other things, about seven or eight other carcinogens in a bottle of Roundup.

What's in your bottle? It's not on the label. And they're going to say, "We only put a little bit in there, just a teeny-weeny bit."

Well, if you only put a teeny-weeny bit, why didn't you tell everybody you only put teeny-weeny bit of seven or eight carcinogens in there so John Durnell could make an intelligent choice?

You know, a company should not be allowed to make choices for consumers. That's what happened here.

They're going to put a little slide up in a while, if they do -- the Court makes us show our slide shows before we give them so the Court can make rulings on it. Even though the judge allowed

most of them, I made a choice here to just talk to you.

2.1

But they're going to put up a slide just from a little tiny deposition clip of a Dr. Hu, H-u. He is John Durnell's treating oncologist. So an oncologist, as you may know, if you have cancer experience, are doctors who treat cancer. And that's what Dr. Hu did for John Durnell, treated his cancer. Great doctor.

They're going to put a little snippet up there to try to make you think that Dr. Hu doesn't think that Roundup caused his cancer. You're going to hear the rest of the story when you hear Dr. Hu's entire testimony, where he said he never read anything about glyphosate. He's never read any epidemiology studies. He's just going on what he heard from somebody else. He doesn't know.

And he'll tell you his job isn't to determine cause, it's to treat. But they're going to make a big deal out of that because they think that somebody on this jury might think that that has some kind were persuasive effect.

They're going to bring in a guy named

Tomasetti and put him right here on the stand. And

he is a smart guy, well-credentialed, impressive.

_

But you know what he is, he's a mathematician.

Now, I will admit I'm not very good at math.

All right. So he's going to get me on math every time. But there's such thing, you all know there's such thing as voodoo math and math. Voodoo economics and economics. And what you're going to hear from him is voodoo.

If you accept his testimony, we might as well shut down -- just shut down the EPA, because his testimony is basically, you know, everybody's cancer is only caused by replication errors in your DNA. That sounds pretty -- that's what -- so let's just shut everything down. Let's go take a bath in Roundup.

It's really foolish, what he says.

MS. COOK: Your Honor, excuse me.

Argumentative.

THE COURT: I'll sustain it.

Let's get to what the facts will show, Mr. Frazer.

MR. FRAZER: Sorry, your Honor, getting a little excited.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. FRAZER: Thank you, Counsel.

So Dr. Tomasetti is a Ph.D. mathematician,

applied mathematics, you can imagine that companies that make stuff that harm people love what he's saying. You're going to hear that he's testified for baby powder, talc companies, where women come in and claim they have uterine cancer from use of baby powder by Johnson & Johnson. You're going to hear that. He gets hired in those cases too.

2.1

I predict he's going to get hired in every cancer case in the United States at some point because, if it was all about the money to me, that's what I would do is hire that guy. I might even bring him in as an employee.

His testimony is just not credible. He's just not credible. And you'll see that. Don't let him pull the wool over your eyes.

But look. Think about what he does say.

Let's accept that it's replication error. Let's just accept it. How do to ignore all the cellular DNA damage studies that are out there that shows when you're exposed to Roundup at a DNA cellular level you have replication error, your DNA gets damaged?

Choices. Freedom. That's really what this case boils down to.

Your Honor, one second. Indulge me, please.

You're going to hear at least one video in 1 2 this case that we are going to play at some point. 3 And videos are kind of boring. It's hard to pay 4 attention to them. You got to look at that screen 5 way over there. If your eyesight is not good, you 6 might want to think about, you know, getting some 7 glasses or something. I got progressives, so if 8 I'm not focused right I can't see it myself. 9 But that they'll play from there. The audio 10 in a big courtroom is hard to hear, so we

But you're going to hear from a guy that worked at Monsanto named Kirk Azevedo.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

apologize.

A-z-e-v-e-d-o I think is how you spell it. Kirk
Azevedo. He said he was excited about working at
Monsanto because he felt Monsanto was about the
future. Because in some respects it is because,
you know what, they have to have it to make the
genetically modified seeds Roundup resistant so
farmers can go spray crops all day long if they
wanted with Roundup and it's not going to kill one
single blade of grass on that plant that's growing.
It will kill everything else, but it won't kill
that crop that's growing.

So they can broadcast spray right in the

tractors. You probably see them if you've gone over to -- anywhere in the country, either west or east.

2.1

That seed is made to be Roundup resistant so -- it's genetically modified seed that they sell to farms everywhere is dependent upon Roundup.

So this guy, Azevedo, he's kind of excited.

That's pretty interesting stuff. Laboratory stuff.

Future.

He comes to a meeting, I think it was here in St. Louis, at Monsanto. He talks to a guy that was then the vice president of the company, a gay named Brett Begemann. He became the chief operating officer of Monsanto. And his comment to Mr. Begemann was, "When are we going to start talking about the future?"

And Begemann said something to this effect, "It's all about the money."

At the end of this case I want to ask you to bring back a verdict on behalf of John Durnell for compensatory damages to compensate him for what he's gone through, his cancer, his chemo, his recovery, the fact that he lives with the idea of remission on his mind every day.

He's going to testify what it's likes when

you're driving to the doctor's office for your six-month visit and just hoping that they're not going to find anything, living with that and all the effect it's had on him.

2.1

Now, he's a strong man. I'm telling you.

I've seen a lot of cancer victims. This man is strong. So he's going to come across strong on the stand, but you're going to hear the effect it's had on his life. You're going to hear a lot of that from his husband, Richard. Just listen.

You're going to have to evaluate that and come back with a verdict that's for reasonable and fair compensation for John Durnell.

If the judge lets us ask you for punitive damages, which his Honor controls that issue completely, and I respect his Honor 100 percent, then we're going to ask you to punish Monsanto for what they've done to John Durnell and to deter them and others from doing this kind of stuff in the future and to stop it now.

What I'm going to ask you to do is to ring the bell for John Durnell. Ring the bell for John Durnell. Thank you for your attention and listening today.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Frazer.

We've been going for just a little bit over an hour. The next thing you're going to hear is the opening from the defense side from Ms. Cook. Let's take ten minutes to let everybody stretch their legs, use the bathroom, get a drink of water.

You know what I'm going to say. Once again,
I'm going to remind you not to form or express any
opinions about the case until it's finally given to
you to decide. Don't do your own independent
research about the case, any information regarding
the case, or any of the attorneys or other
witnesses involved. Don't follow any news programs
or do any research about with coverage of the case.

I'll let you go upstairs, get a drink of water, bring you back in about ten minutes for the defense opening statement.

(Recess taken.)