

Yet the report includes these gems:

“Extensive animal data has demonstrated glyphosate does not cause cancer/tumors.

Multiple lifetime cancer studies from multiple glyphosate registrants, performed independently over the past 35 years have demonstrated that glyphosate does not cause tumors/cancer in rodent species (see glyphosate resources, appendix to this document).”

“Surfactant components are not expected to contribute to cancer or endocrine risks.

The category of surfactants used in the Roundup™ formulation used in the study was evaluated by the US EPA in 2009 and was considered acceptable for this use in pesticide products based on the results of multiple repeat dose studies, including reproductive and developmental toxicology. Consumers have a regular exposure to surfactant materials in the form of shampoos, soaps, and cleaning products. These are not believed to present reproductive/endocrine risks. Further, exposure to surfactant residues as a result of pesticide exposures represents a very small portion of human surfactant exposures.”

“Reviews of long term studies by scientists, physicians, and regulators have reached the conclusion that GM crops are safe.”

So as we can see, this report starts off by stating that it does not meet minimum acceptable standards for this type of scientific research, yet make audacious claims stating that its products are safe, and not hazardous to humans, even without minimum acceptable standards being met. Quite a contradiction, one might conclude.

Like what you've read? Check more out at:

BCCaravan.com

or email us at:

Theshark642@gmail.com or Braincandycaravan@gmail.com

Monsanto

Who are they, and what do they do?

A Shark Enterprise Production
2014
FREE

Contents:

- 1) What is biotechnology?
- 2) Monsanto: A history
- 3) Modern Monsanto: What they do
- 4) Monsanto Vs Farmers
- 5) Ten things Monsanto doesn't want you to know
- 6) What is this shit?

This production is based in as much fact as is possible. Taken from the Monsanto Corporation itself, Organic Farmers Association, The Center for Food Safety, and other sources, I attempt to write an as unbiased account of whats really happening, and what it all means.

Thanks for reading,
Shark

Research protocol does not meet OECD standards.

Source and quality of corn used is unclear.

Critical details on diet preparation and dietary intake are absent.

Complete lack of data pertaining to assertions of microscopically visible changes in liver or kidney tissues (abnormal histopathology) and laboratory testing results of blood and urine analyses.

Lack of any statistical analysis for mortality or tumor incidence endpoints. Monsanto statistical analysis of deaths based on visual approximation of the graphical data indicates a lack of statistical significance even when liberal criteria are applied.

Mortality rates and tumor incidence in all groups fall within historical norms for this strain of laboratory rats, which is known for a high incidence of tumors.

Data presented are highly selective, using (for example) different methods for male and female animals, and are not sufficient to support conclusions drawn

There is a lack of dose-response relationship throughout the study.

There is no plausible mechanism for the results reported with genetically modified maize, and the results are inconsistent with an extensive body of experience and scientific study.

Extensive animal and *in-vitro* (test-tube) data has demonstrated that glyphosate does not cause cancer or tumors, nor is an endocrine disrupter. This study does not provide information which calls into question the extensive safety evaluations of glyphosate or Roundup herbicides. Plant biotechnology has been in use for over 15 years, without documented evidence of adverse effects on human or animal health or the environment. An extensive body of scientific evidence, reviewed by regulatory agencies around the globe, supports the safety of plant biotechnology in general as well as the specific safety of NK603 maize.

Long term toxicity of a Roundup herbicide and a Roundup-tolerant genetically modified maize.

Gilles-Eric Séralini, Emilie Clair, Robin Mesnage, Steeve Gress, Nicolas Defarge, Manuela Malatesta, Didier Hennequin, Joël Spiroux de Vendômois Food and Chemical Toxicology (electronic ahead of press)
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0278691512005637>

Associated website and videos:

<http://www.ogm-alerte-mondiale.net/?lang=en>
<http://www.youtube.com/channel/UCktZ44yjV7cq0yFhQlrpyOg?feature=guide>
http://www.dailymotion.com/Lieurac_Productions

Summary:

This study does not meet minimum acceptable standards for this type of scientific research, the findings are not supported by the data presented, and the conclusions are not relevant for the purpose of safety assessment. The study has been the subject of initial critical reviews by multiple regulatory agencies (links provided below). For example, the Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR) in Germany states that *“the authors’ main statements are not sufficiently corroborated by experimental evidence, due to deficiencies in the study design and in the presentation and interpretation of the study results.”*

Toxicologists and public health experts also find fundamental problems with the study design. Critical information about how the research was conducted is absent, and the data presented do not support the author’s interpretations.

Among the key shortcomings are:

What is Biotechnology?

Biotechnology is the use of living systems and organisms to develop or make useful products, or "any technological application that uses biological systems, living organisms or derivatives thereof, to make or modify products or processes for specific use" (UN Convention on Biological Diversity, Art. 2)

For thousands of years, humankind has used biotechnology in agriculture, food production, and medicine. The wide concept of "biotech" or "biotechnology" encompasses a wide range of procedures (and history) for modifying living organisms according to human purposes, going back to domestication of animals, cultivation of plants, and "improvements" to these through breeding programs that employ artificial selection and hybridization. Modern usage also includes genetic engineering as well as cell and tissue culture technologies. The American Chemical Society defines biotechnology as the application of biological organisms, systems, or processes by various industries to learning about the science of life and the improvement of the value of materials and organisms such as pharmaceuticals, crops, and livestock. In other words, biotechnology can be defined as the mere application of technical advances in life science to develop commercial products.

For the duration of this production, we will be focusing on mainly agricultural, and industrial biotechnology.

Agricultural Biotechnology

Genetically modified crops ("GM crops", or "biotech crops") are plants used in agriculture, the DNA of which has been modified using genetic engineering techniques. In most cases the aim is to introduce a new trait to the

plant which does not occur naturally in the species.

Examples in food crops include resistance to certain pests, diseases, stressful environmental conditions, resistance to chemical treatments (e.g. resistance to a herbicide), reduction of spoilage, or improving the nutrient profile of the crop. Examples in non-food crops include production of pharmaceutical agents, biofuels, and other industrially useful goods, as well as for bio-remediation.

Genetically modified foods are foods produced from organisms that have had specific changes introduced into their DNA using the methods of genetic engineering. These techniques have allowed for the introduction of new crop traits as well as a far greater control over a food's genetic structure than previously afforded by methods such as selective breeding, and mutation breeding. Commercial sale of genetically modified foods began in 1994, when Calgene first marketed its Flavr Savr delayed ripening tomato. To date most genetic modification of foods have primarily focused on cash crops in high demand by farmers such as soybean, corn, canola, and cotton seed oil. These have been engineered for resistance to pathogens and herbicides and better nutrient profiles. GM livestock have also been experimentally developed, although as of November 2013 none are currently on the market.

There is broad scientific consensus that food on the market derived from GM crops poses no greater risk to human health than conventional food. GM crops also provide a number of ecological benefits, if not used in excess. However, opponents have objected to GM crops per se on several grounds, including environmental concerns, whether food produced from GM crops is safe, whether GM crops are needed to address the world's food needs, and economic concerns raised by the fact these organisms are subject to intellectual property law.

We must ask ourselves though, as with politicians, who's paying these scientists?

Starbucks, under pressure from the OCA and our allies, has likewise banned rBGH milk.

8) GMO Crops Do Not Increase Yields

A major UN/World Bank-sponsored report compiled by 400 scientists and endorsed by 58 countries concluded that GM crops have little to offer to the challenges of poverty, hunger, and climate change. Better alternatives are available. The report championed organic farming as the sustainable way forward for developing countries.

9) Monsanto Controls US Soy Market

In 1996, when Monsanto began selling Roundup Ready soybeans, only 2% of soybeans in the US contained their patented gene. By 2008, over 90% of soybeans in the US contained Monsanto's gene.

10) GMO Foods May Lead to Food Allergies

In March 1999, UK researchers at the York Laboratory were alarmed to discover that reactions to soy had skyrocketed by 50% over the previous year. Genetically modified soy had recently entered the UK from US imports and the soy used in the study was largely GM.

What is this shit?

The following is part of an updated report put out by Monsanto November 11th, 2012.

The entire report can be read here:

<http://www.monsanto.com/products/documents/productsafety/seralini-sept-2012-monsanto-comments.pdf>

4) Monsanto Products Pollute the Developing World

According to plant pathologist Don Huber, glyphosate, the active ingredient in Monsanto's Roundup, changes soil ecology, making plants susceptible to diseases that could eventually cause diseases in humans. Glyphosate kills many bacteria, giving other bacteria a competitive advantage. It also makes plants highly susceptible to soil borne diseases. With increasing use of glyphosate, Huber said a number of plant pathogens are "emerging" or "re-emerging," including a number of fusarium and root rot diseases. At the same time that diseases are increasing, glyphosate has a negative effect on a number of beneficial soil organisms, including those that fix nitrogen, mycorrhizae, plant growth promoting organisms and earthworms. Huber's allegations of the impact of glyphosate in soil sterility echo those of Elaine Ingham, a soil ecologist with the Rodale Institute.

5) Monsanto in Bed with Government Regulators

A revolving door exists between Monsanto and US regulatory and judicial bodies making key decisions. Justice Clarence Thomas, a former Monsanto lawyer, was the one who wrote the majority opinion on a key Monsanto case. Michael Taylor once worked for the FDA, later represented Monsanto as a lawyer, then returned as the FDA's Deputy Commissioner for Policy when rBGH, a growth hormone used to make dairy cows produce more milk, was granted approval.

6) Monsanto Guilty of False Advertising

France's highest court ruled in 2009 that Monsanto had lied about the safety of its weed killer Roundup. The court confirmed an earlier judgement that Monsanto had falsely advertised its herbicide as "biodegradable".

7) Consumers Reject Bovine Growth Hormone

In the wake of mass consumer pressure, major retailers such as Safeway, Publix, Wal-Mart, and Kroger banned store brand milk products containing Monsanto's controversial genetically engineered hormone rBGH.

Industrial Biotechnology

Industrial biotechnology (known mainly in Europe as white biotechnology) is the application of biotechnology for industrial purposes, including industrial fermentation. It includes the practice of using cells such as micro-organisms, or components of cells like enzymes, to generate industrially useful products in sectors such as chemicals, food and feed, detergents, paper and pulp, textiles and bio-fuels. In doing so, biotechnology uses renewable raw materials and may contribute to lowering greenhouse gas emissions and moving away from a petrochemical-based economy.

Monsanto: A History

Monsanto began in 1901 as a small chemical start-up by John Francis Queeney, a man in the wholesale drug industry. Its first product was saccharin, a sugar substitute, and it became the major supplier of inputs for another relatively new company, Coca-Cola. By the 1920s, Monsanto's product line had expanded to include sedatives, laxatives and aspirin. In the late 1920s, John Queeney's son Edgar took over and drastically expanded operations: Monsanto began producing everything from synthetic fibers, plastics and rubber goods to industrial chemicals, fertilizers, and pesticides and herbicides.

After a period focused on agrichemicals — including production of the notorious Agent Orange, and production of PCBs, a class of chemicals so toxic that they were banned in the 1970s but still pollute the environment today — Monsanto transitioned beyond chemicals into seeds. After its creation of an agricultural division in 1960, Monsanto went on a buying spree for the next 40 years, acquiring and merging with dozens of seed and agricultural companies (and shedding its

chemical and industrial divisions) to broaden its operations once again and shift itself exclusively into the agricultural market.

Modern Monsanto: What they do

Monsanto began its research and production of agrochemicals in the 1960s. In 1982, Monsanto's scientists became the first to genetically modify a plant cell. Throughout the 1990s, Monsanto gradually shed its plastics, chemicals and fibers companies and rapidly acquired multiple seed and agricultural companies, shifting its identity from a chemical company to one that produced GE crops and linked agrochemicals — a life sciences company.

Monsanto's wildly popular herbicide Roundup guaranteed the company a top spot as it transitioned into the agriculture market. Sales from Roundup and other glyphosatebased herbicides accounted for 27 percent of Monsanto's total 2011 net sales. Monsanto engineers its GE seeds to resist Roundup and Roundup alone, so that the sale of the herbicide is absolutely necessary for those who buy Roundup Ready seeds.

Most of Monsanto's market strength comes from its genetically engineered seeds. Genetic engineering modifies the genetic material of crops to display specific traits. Most commercial biotech crops are developed to be either herbicide tolerant, allowing herbicides to kill weeds without harming crops, or insect resistant, which protects plants from destructive pests. Monsanto creates many of both types. Monsanto not only markets its own patented seeds, but it uses licensing agreements with other companies and distributors to spread its traits throughout the seed supply. *An Associated Press*

increasingly herbicide-resistant, Monsanto sells more and more chemicals to farmers who are caught in this vicious cycle. Due to the enormous political clout of Monsanto, the American public is being denied the right to know whether their foods are genetically engineered or not. Following is a list of 10 facts about Monsanto and GMOs, and how they can adversely affect your health, local farmers, and the planet.

1) No GMO Labeling Laws in the US

More than 70% of processed foods in the US contain GMO ingredients. Yet because Monsanto has fought hard to prevent labeling laws in the US, this information is kept from consumers. The US is the only developed country in the world that does not have mandatory GMO labeling laws — even though more than 62 other countries, including Japan, China, Korea, Australia, New Zealand and the entire European Union, have either banned GMOs or have laws requiring mandatory labeling.

2) Lack of Adequate Safety Testing

In May 1992, Vice President Dan Quayle announced the FDA's consumer right-to-know policy which stated that GMO foods need not be labeled nor safety-tested. Meanwhile, prominent scientists such as Arpad Pusztai and Gilles-Eric Seralini have publicized alarming research revealing severe damage to animals fed GMO foods.

3) Monsanto Puts Small Farmers out of Business

Percy Schmeiser is a Canadian farmer whose canola fields were contaminated with Monsanto's Roundup Ready Canola by pollen from a nearby GMO farm. Monsanto successfully argued in a lawsuit that Schmeiser violated the company's patent rights, and tried to force Schmeiser to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars in damages. This type of biotech bullying is happening all over North America.

- The number of seed piracy matters reported by Monsanto is 20 to 40 times the number of lawsuits we have found in public court records.
- The estimated total of settlements paid to Monsanto by farmers (\$85.7 to \$160.6 million) exceeds by four to eight times the total of recorded judgements (\$21.6 million).

For more detailed information, read: Monsanto Vs. U.S. Farmers. A report by the Center for Food Safety.

“The World According to Monsanto” By Marie-Monique Robin

Ten Things Monsanto Doesn't Want You to Know

What's wrong with Genetic Engineering?

Genetic engineering refers to a set of technologies used to change the genetic makeup of cells and move genes across species boundaries to produce novel organisms. Once released, these genetically modified organisms (GMOs) can easily spread and interbreed with other organisms, and they are virtually impossible to recall back to the laboratory.

Monsanto provides roughly 90% of GMO seeds in the world. These seeds have been genetically modified to produce their own pesticide or to survive repeated spraying of Monsanto's toxic herbicide Roundup. Monsanto's GMOs are not designed to increase yields to feed the world, but rather to increase Monsanto's profits. Monsanto sells high-priced, patented seeds to farmers who are required to sign contracts stating that they will buy new seeds every year. And as their crops become

investigation found that these agreements stipulate how competitors can use Monsanto's traits in their products, and negotiate discounts received for keeping a certain amount of Monsanto's products in stock; some contracts even affected ownership of smaller seed companies by requiring them to destroy their Monsanto inventory if ownership changed. By 2010, Monsanto's traits were present in 95 percent of the U.S. GE corn seed market and 89 percent of the U.S. GE cotton seed market. The acreage on which Monsanto's GE crop traits are grown has increased from a total of 3 million acres in 1996 to 282.3 million acres worldwide and 151.4 million acres in the United States in 2009. Roughly 382 million acres in the United States are used for crop production, so that means that Monsanto's products constitute approximately 40 percent of all crop acres in the country. Monsanto's research and development surpasses other companies, as it holds six times as many permits for field trials of biotech seeds as any other company in the United States. A lawyer working for DuPont, the next largest competitor in the seed business, said, “a seed company can't stay in business without offering seeds with Roundup Ready in it, so if they want to stay in that business, essentially they have to do what Monsanto tells them to do.” While Monsanto's sheer size and the power of its product lines gives it an obvious edge, there's something more to the story of its unbridled success. It's the way Monsanto does business: how it interacts with and influences governments; its aggressive tactics against its own customers and competition; and its ruthless expansion into foreign markets.

Influence in Government

Monsanto has a long history with former and current employees of the U.S. government, public universities and industry and trade groups. There has been a continuous “revolving door” between these institutions and Monsanto's Board of Directors and senior staff, offering some explanation for Monsanto's powerful

influence in policy and public research. Monsanto's board members have worked for the EPA, advised the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and served on President Obama's Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations. They presided over multiple universities in various senior positions, including South Dakota State University (with whom Monsanto has a significant research agreement), Arizona State's Biodesign Institute, and Washington University in St. Louis. Monsanto shares board members with other corporations such as Procter & Gamble, Lockheed Martin and Synthetic Genomics. The company's board members have been a part of the International Food and Agricultural Trade Policy Council, the Council for Biotechnology Information, the United Kingdom Academy of Medicine, the National Academy of Sciences Biological Weapons working group, CropLife International, and the Council on Foreign Relations. The prevalence of Monsanto's directors in these highly influential positions begs a closer look at how they're able to push the pro-GE agenda within the government and influence public opinion.

Monsanto Vs Farmers

Number of Lawsuits Filed Against U.S. Farmers:

- As of November 28, 2012, Monsanto had filed 142 lawsuits against farmers for alleged violations of its Technology Agreement and/or its patents on genetically engineered seeds.
- These cases have involved 410 farmers and 56 small farm businesses.

Status of Lawsuits:

- 72 lawsuits ended in recorded damages awarded to Monsanto.

- 27 lawsuits ended in unrecorded damages awarded to Monsanto (confidential settlements).
- 14 lawsuits were dismissed, with no indication of whether damages were awarded to Monsanto.
- 11 lawsuits were ongoing as of November 28, 2012.

Lawsuits Filed by State:

- Monsanto has sued farmers and small farm businesses in *at least* 27 different states.

Recorded Judgement (as of November 28, 2012):

- Sums awarded to Monsanto in 72 recorded judgements against farmers totalled \$23,675,820.99.
- The largest judgement was \$3,052,800.00.
- The smallest judgement was \$5,595.00.

Out-of-Court Settlements:

These recorded judgements fail to convey a true picture of the scope of Monsanto's aggressive actions against U.S. farmers. This is because the majority of cases brought by Monsanto end in confidential, out-of-court settlements. Press reports and Monsanto's own statements suggest that the company investigates roughly 500 farmers each year.⁴ In one case, *Monsanto vs. McFarling*, District Court Judge Catherine D. Perry stated "[t]he vast majority of cases filed by Monsanto against farmers have been settled before any extensive litigation took place." Center for Food Safety has compiled information formerly available on Monsanto's website to arrive at estimates of the total sums paid to Monsanto by farmers in what the company calls "seed piracy matters."

- As of June 2006, Monsanto had instituted an estimated 2,391 to 4,531 "seed piracy matters" against farmers in 19 states.
- Farmers have paid Monsanto an estimated \$85,653,601 to \$160,594,230 in settlements of these seed piracy matters.