

Appendix 8: Well-Earned Reputation of “Most Hated Company”

[Modern Farmer](#)'s headline begs the question: Why Does Everyone Hate Monsanto? In their subhead, they flatly conclude, “In recent years, no company has been more associated with evil than Monsanto.”¹ Whether it's the Most Hated, Most Evil, or [the Angry Mermaid Award](#), Monsanto has been winning big in the worst of the worst category for years.²³⁴⁵

The reputation long preceded GMOs, with Agent Orange, DDT, and PCBs among their accomplishments. For example, according to February 23, 2002, Washington Post article, [Monsanto was convicted](#) of “negligence, wantonness, suppression of the truth, nuisance, trespass and outrage.”⁶ Under Alabama law, the rare claim of outrage typically requires conduct “...so outrageous in character and extreme in degree as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency so as to be regarded as atrocious and utterly intolerable in civilized society.” It turns out that “Monsanto documents show[ed] that the company routinely dumped PCB in Anniston and covered up its behavior for more than 40 years.” The lawsuit represented over twenty thousand Anniston residents and resulted in a \$700 million fine. The Anniston suit was presented in detail on PBS' [Bill Moyers show](#).⁷

To learn more about Monsanto's transgressions, view the 10-part Huffington Post Blog [here](#). Here are just a few of the company's corporate practices that raise the ire of the public.

MANIPULATOR OF PUBLIC OPINION

Threatening letters from Monsanto's attorneys have resulted in the cancellation of a five-part news series on their genetically engineered bovine growth hormone scheduled for a Fox TV station in Florida, as well as the cancellation of a book critical of Monsanto's GMO products. A printer also shredded 14,000 copies of the *Ecologist* magazine issue entitled “The Monsanto Files,” due to fear of a Monsanto lawsuit.⁸

SILENCING INDEPENDENT SCIENTISTS

Not only are adverse findings by independent scientists often suppressed, ignored, or denied, researchers that discover problems from GM foods have been fired, stripped of responsibilities, deprived of tenure, and even threatened. Consider Dr. Pusztai, the world's leading scientist in his field, who inadvertently discovered in 1998 that unpredictable changes in GM crops caused massive damage in rats. He went public with his concerns, was a hero at his prestigious institute for two days, and then, after the director received two phone calls allegedly from the UK Prime Minister's office, was fired after 35 years and silenced with threats of a lawsuit. False statements were circulated to trash his reputation, which are recited by GMO advocates today. Insiders allege that the source of the UK government's actions started with a call from Monsanto to President Clinton's office.

After University of California Professor Ignacio Chapela, PhD, published evidence that Monsanto's GM corn contaminated Mexico's indigenous varieties, two fictitious internet characters created by Monsanto's PR firm, the Bivings Group, initiated a brutal internet smear campaign, slandering Dr. Chapela and his research.

Irina Ermakova, PhD, a leading scientist at the Russian National Academy of Sciences, fed female rats Monsanto's GM soy and was stunned to discover that more than half their offspring died within three weeks—compared to only 10% from mothers fed non-GM soy. Without funding to extend her analysis, she labeled her work “preliminary,” published it in a Russian journal, and implored the scientific

Appendix 8: Well-Earned Reputation of “Most Hated Company”

community to repeat the study. Two years later, no one has repeated it, but advocates use false or irrelevant arguments to divert attention from the shocking results and have tried to vilify Dr. Ermakova.

A New Zealand MP testified at the 2001 Royal Commission of Inquiry on Genetic Modification, “I have been contacted by telephone and e-mail by a number of scientists who have serious concerns . . . but who are convinced that if they express these fears publicly. . . or even if they asked the awkward and difficult questions, they will be eased out of their institution.” Indeed in 2007, after Professor Christian Velot, PhD, raised the difficult questions on GMOs at public conferences, his 2008 research funds were confiscated, his student assistants were re-assigned, and his position at the University of Paris-Sud faced early termination.

STUDIES ARE RIGGED TO AVOID FINDING PROBLEMS

When Monsanto learned that independent researchers were planning to publish a study in July 1999 showing that GM soy contains 12%-14% less cancer-fighting phytoestrogens than non-GM soy, the company responded with its own study, concluding that soy’s phytoestrogen levels vary too much to even carry out a statistical analysis. Researchers failed to disclose, however, that they had instructed the laboratory to use an obsolete method of detection—one that had been prone to highly variable results.⁹

To show that pasteurization destroyed Monsanto’s bovine growth hormone in milk from cows treated with rbGH, scientists pasteurized the milk 120 times longer than normal. [Unable to destroy](#) more than 19%, they then spiked the milk with a huge amount of the hormone and repeated the long pasteurization, destroying 90%.¹⁰ ([The FDA reported](#) that pasteurization destroys 90% of the hormone¹¹ and approved Monsanto’s hormone.)

To demonstrate that injections of rbGH did not interfere with cow’s fertility, Monsanto apparently added cows to the study that were pregnant prior to injection.¹²

Other methods used to hide problems are varied and plentiful. For example, researchers of Monsanto’s products:

- Use highly variable animal starting weights to hinder detection of food-related changes
- Keep feeding studies short to miss long-term impacts
- Test effects of Roundup Ready soybeans that have not been sprayed with Roundup
- Avoid feeding animals the actual GM crop, but give them instead a single dose of the GM protein that was produced inside GM bacteria
- Use too few subjects to derive statistically significant results
- Use poor statistical methods or simply leave out essential methods, data, or statistics
- Use irrelevant control groups, and employ insensitive evaluation techniques

Monsanto’s stated goal, according to its then-consultant at a 1999 biotech conference in San Francisco, was to genetically engineer 100% of all the commercial seeds in the world and patent them.

¹ *Modern Farmer* (2014). “Why does everyone hate Monsanto?” (March).

<http://modernfarmer.com/2014/03/monsantos-good-bad-pr-problem/>

² Organic Consumers Association. <https://www.organicconsumers.org/essays/why-monsanto-won-angry-mermaid-award>

Appendix 8: Well-Earned Reputation of “Most Hated Company”

- ³ The Motley Fool (2013) “Why is Monsanto the Most Hated Company in the World?” (June).
<http://www.fool.com/investing/general/2013/06/08/why-is-monsanto-the-most-hated-company-in-the-worl.aspx>
- ⁴ American Politics (2013). “Why is Monsanto the Most Hated Company in the World?” (June)
<http://mwamericanpolitics.blogspot.com/2013/06/why-is-monsanto-most-hated-company-in.html>
- ⁵ Natural News (2011) “Monsanto Voted Most Evil Corporation of the Year by Natural News Readers.” (Jan)
http://www.naturalnews.com/030967_Monsanto_evil.html#ixzz1AqQqFuBS
- ⁶ The Guardian (2002) “Monsanto Found Guilty of Polluting,” (Feb).
<http://www.ethicalinvesting.com/monsanto/news/10074.htm>
- ⁷ PBS NOW (undated) Transcript Toxic Communities
http://www.pbs.org/now/printable/transcript_toxic_print.html
- ⁸ Jeffrey M. Smith, Seeds of Deception, Yes! Books, Fairfield, IA 2003, See the chapter “Muscling the Media” for more examples.
- ⁹ Marc Lappé and Britt Bailey (1999) “ASA Response,” (June)
www.environmentalcommons.org/cetos/articles/asaresponse.html
- ¹⁰ Paul P. Groenewegen, Brian W. McBride, John H. Burton, Theodore H. Elsasser. "Bioactivity of Milk from bST-Treated Cows." J. Nutrition 120, 1990, pp. 514-519 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2341916>
- ¹¹ Judith C. Juskevich and C. Greg Guyer. "Bovine Growth Hormone: Human Food Safety Evaluation." Science, vol. 249. August 24, 1990, pp. 875-884 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2203142>
- ¹² Pete Hardin, “rbGH: Appropriate Studies Haven’t Been Done,” The Milkweed, July 2000.