

The Screen Text for the Movie— **“The Case Against Monsanto’s Transgenic Food and Agricultural System— And One Thing to Do About It”**

Preface

A copy of the all the screen text is provided, so viewers may read it before or after watching the movie—and have it available for easy reference if they would like. The complex underlying array of detail pertinent to OSGATA et al. v. Monsanto can be daunting for many people who may not even know what Monsanto is, and this film, like the film “What Do You Know About Monsanto,” is more wonkish than most, laden with more detail in a text thread than most other documentaries.

Hopefully, many viewers will have an appetite for the level of detail provided, but some may want to ignore the screen text. Nonetheless, it is provided for those who are interested in the supporting information about a complex topic. An important part of the story is in the text, because the movie would need to be longer if it were not provided as it has been.

Some people may be more able than others to read and listen at the same time. This is an acquired skill gained through practice and focus. The film promotes time for the practice to occur, and many find they have learned to handle the additional information over the course of watching the film. Nonetheless, people can ignore the text if they want to. In providing it, the premise is: people may have questions they want answered even as they watch and listen. The screen text is used to address this need and to expand the viewing horizon. It can be used or not as is desired.

Experience with many viewers of this film shows the screen text has been found useful even among those who were not, at the outset, prepared for the role it plays. Some who start out not wanting to read screen text find themselves starting to get interested in it as they learn they can both listen and read at the same time. By adding text to the video and audio threads, this film becomes a cinema-graphic brochure, and that is found to be

Screen Text of the Movie: The Case Against Monsanto's Transgenic Food..., page 2

important in conveying the detail required to gain a broader understanding of the topic. Nonetheless, it cannot cover everything needed to understand the larger topic of transgenic food and agriculture. Even viewing all of the available films will leave many questions unanswered. All of them convey important parts of the story.

This film is about one lawsuit, the issues raised, the history of the defendant, the motivation and thoughts of some of the plaintiffs and the state of awareness of the public. Thus, it is not the best film to use as an introduction to transgenic agriculture and transgenic food. Other films, like "Food, Inc.," "The Future of Food," "The World According to Monsanto," and "Scientists Under Attack," provide parts of the needed introduction to the topic, and "Genetic Roulette" does an important job in addressing the health issues in greater detail. The URLs to access these films and more can be found at the Web site: www.EndTransgenicTrespass.org.

To understand the important details and aspects of the issue more completely, more reading and film watching would be needed. For that reason, a list of films, an annotated bibliography, and more information is provided on the Web site. For the benefit of everyone and everyone's grandchildren and great-grandchildren, people need invest time in watching more than one film. This is the work responsible citizenship requires of everyone. On subjects like this, there can be no substitute for informed citizenship, and there is no issue that is more important. Literally. Not climate chaos. Not other pollution issues. Not even war.

Especially when the corporate media have so far left the public poorly informed on the issues raised in the lawsuit OSGATA et al. v. Monsanto, the labor of becoming informed takes greater public diligence than it has received. This failure, like the issues raised, comes at high public cost.

The Case Against Monsanto's Transgenic Food and Agricultural System

Alexis Baden-Mayer, Political Director,
Organic Consumers Association

The aerial spraying of Roundup (Glyphosate) allows spray drift to fall on nearby communities, impairing reproductive fertility and causing birth defects. Glyphosate also binds to soil minerals making them unavailable to crops. Food quality is compromised.

Screen Text of the Movie: The Case Against Monsanto's Transgenic Food..., page 3

Don Patterson, one of the 83 plaintiffs in the lawsuit OSGATA et al. v. Monsanto, speaking at Rebecca's Natural Foods in Charlottesville, Virginia, March 2012.

OSGATA et al. v. Monsanto seeks a "declaratory judgment" from the court to protect farmers against patent infringement lawsuits and the associated harassment when their non-transgenic crops become contaminated by Monsanto's transgenic crops.

This has happened in both the United States and Canada. Some plaintiffs in the lawsuit are Canadian.

The lawsuit also puts Monsanto's transgenic system of agriculture on trial. Evidence will show the health and environmental damage. The government would have done this work long before now if corporate politics had not over-ridden prudence.

Bush-Quayle overruled FDA scientists in 1992, arbitrarily declaring transgenic food was safe. Objective, independent verification was evaded.

More than a dozen independent studies in other nations have examined the dangers of transgenic food, but patent holders prevent such studies in the U.S. Patent law, government laxity, and corporate political power allow U.S. companies to safety test their own products.

Politically-promoted, ideologically-wishful deregulation has prevented responsible oversight.

Independent, objective, multi-generational U.S. investigation of transgenic food safety should be required, but it is not. Instead citizens are lab rats in an unmonitored experiment. Digestive disorders have reportedly increased by 40% since transgenic food was put was introduced.

Human infertility has also greatly increased.

Companies, and government, including the U.S. Congress and federal agencies (particularly the FDA, EPA, USDA) need to account for the their failure to study the health impacts of transgenic food and associated chemicals.

Government officials facilitate unregulated corporate profiteering.

U.S. farm policy has driven farmers out of business, and farm land has been bought up by speculators. Since Earl Butz headed the USDA, the maxim has been: "Get Big

Screen Text of the Movie: The Case Against Monsanto's Transgenic Food..., page 4 or Get Out."

Opinion: U.S. farm policy has been destructively misguided and misdirected.

U.S. policy promotes industrialized, mechanized, fuel-reliant, chemically-intensive agriculture, but myopically so. Unwise, unsustainable policy increases capital dependency and agribusiness control over farmers and food.

Government policy has lowered food quality and subverted public health.

U.S. policy incentives produce devitalized food, using destructive, unsustainable practices to increase agribusiness and healthcare profits at high long-term cost.

Eizenstat is "Senior Strategist" at APCO International.

Farm policy has kept commodity prices low with unhealthy dietary dependence on cheap transgenic corn, soybeans, sugar-beets, canola, and high yield, high-starch, protein-deprived, hybrid grains.

Alfalfa and grasses have also been corrupted transgenically without prudent, objective, independent testing.

Biotech agribusiness has many "astroturf" organizations to advance its goals. With help from the Farm Bureau, they create one as they are needed.

Monsanto also has many profit pursuing allies and camp followers.

The Farm Bureau is an insurance company and agribusiness conglomerate masquerading as the nation's largest farm organization, but that is only because they require customers to buy a membership.

From its beginnings in 1911, the Farm Bureau has been a pro-agribusiness, pro-corporate voice opposing the populist farm groups then arising in the West to defend against the political and economic power of the railroads, the commodity traders, and eastern bankers.

Some believe the Gates Foundation promotes transgenic food to reduce fertility and control population in Africa and elsewhere. With its expanding number of fertility clinics, the United States may have been the test lab.

Screen Text of the Movie: The Case Against Monsanto's Transgenic Food..., page 5

Internet searching on this opinion finds many references, but no "smoking gun" evidence.

One percent of U.S. farmland is farmed by certified organic farmers. They total about 0.75% of the farmers and grow about 7% of the food eaten by people. Transgenic corn and soy are the two largest U.S. crops. They are used mostly for animal feed and biofuel.

When beverages are added to the total food, the organic portion falls to about 4% of total U.S. consumption. Many beverages contain high fructose transgenic corn syrup.

Rules vary from nation to nation, but Monsanto 810 corn with toxic Bt transgenes to kill corn borers is banned in: Austria, Hungary, Greece, France, Luxembourg, Bulgaria, Germany, and Poland. The seeds are "stacked" with both Roundup Ready and poisonous Bt traits.

The 2012 ban in Poland was based on bee deaths attributed to MON 810 corn. Bans in other nations are expected, but U.S. agribusiness leverage supports EPA stonewalling of action to protect U.S. bees.

Both political parties have been shameful. Promises of change have been worthless.

Monsanto's 810 Bt corn has been allowed in: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, the European Union, Japan, South Korea, Mexico, Taiwan, the Philippines, South Africa, United States, and Uruguay.

Monsanto has 18 lobbyists in Brussels, so the E.U. permits MON 810 corn even when member European nations do not.

The German urine samples showed concentrations of Glyphosate at 5 to 20 times the level allowed in drinking water. Studies have linked Glyphosate to birth defects, cancer, endocrine disruption, and abnormal sperm. It is a "hormone replacer" and killer of gut flora.

Pro-biotic Intestinal flora are essential to a functional immune system.

Glyphosate (Roundup) and other agri-chemicals can also spread in fog and rain; aerial spraying is not the only issue. Herbicide resistant transgenic grass adds parks, golf courses, lawns, and sports fields to the places where human and animal

Screen Text of the Movie: The Case Against Monsanto's Transgenic Food..., page 6
illness will be promoted.

Monsanto reported lobbying expenditures of \$52 million from 2002-2012. Of the 73 Senators voting against transgenic food labeling in 2012, 37 had received a total of \$237,500 from Monsanto's PAC.

In her case dismissal, Judge Buchwald impugned the plaintiffs for inflating a "non-existent" controversy. She said everyone should feel comforted by Monsanto's undefined, unenforceable, historically untrustworthy "promise" not to sue over "inadvertent, trace" contamination.

The plaintiffs believe the judge failed to fulfill a core legal obligation: she ignored pertinent precedents and uncontroverted facts in the filed complaint. Instead, she accepted an orally-asserted Monsanto contention without any supporting evidence.

Judges Dyk, Bryson, and Moore of the Appeals Court of the Federal Circuit reexamined "de-novo" the contentions on both sides starting with oral arguments on January 10, 2013.

If the appeal is won, the case returns to federal district court in New York where Monsanto plans to request another dismissal and a venue change to St. Louis.

Historically, federal judges in St. Louis have been friendly toward Monsanto.

Based on attitudes in Judge Buchwald's dismissal decision, the venue change could be granted before the second dismissal is filed. The judge might be happy to hand the case to someone else.

When Monsanto sued seed cleaner "Moe" Parr, the first thing the judge said when the trial opened was "how proud" he was to have such an important company as Monsanto in his courtroom. Parr reports knowing right then his "goose was cooked."

Parr could not afford to appeal the case, so he settled, and Monsanto got what it wanted: a way to strike fear into other seed cleaners who might be asked to clean a farmer's contaminated seeds.

More about the Parr story is in the movie: "Food, Inc."

In very minute quantities, Glyphosate has caused defects in chicken and frog

Screen Text of the Movie: The Case Against Monsanto's Transgenic Food..., page 7

embryos, so chemical run-off into streams, rivers, and lakes is likely to affect aquatic life. Sea urchin eggs do not hatch after exposure to Glyphosate, so that gives a clue.

Failure to examine these issues prior to product release was negligent, irresponsible, even criminal.

When Glyphosate is mixed in water, it evaporates with the water and rises into rainclouds to be spread in rain, but studies examining these impacts have not been made. They are needed and should be demanded.

The contamination of urban citizens needs to be better understood.

Monsanto claimed transgenic crops would use less herbicide and pesticide, but the USGS has proved this untrue in their Mississippi basin study.

If judges did media interviews, Judge Buchwald might be asked why she trusted Monsanto's unsupported, undefined, unenforceable "weaselly promise" not to sue for "trace" amounts of "inadvertent" contamination.

And what if the contamination is more than a "trace" amount?

Agent Orange is made of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T with varying amounts of dioxin. Over 400,000 U.S. Vietnam veterans have suffered from exposure to it. The barrels were cut open and used for other purposes by the troops. They were told it was safe.

The herbicide 2,4-D has been linked to Diabetes, Parkinsonism, Melanoma, and other cancers, but the impacts on soil life have been ignored as if they would not matter. Chemical agriculture treats soil as a dead medium.

Soil scientists say only about 2% of what goes on in soil is understood, so it is arrogant and also ignorant to corrupt soil life as if that did no harm. Soil microorganisms give soil healthful energy. They are essential to a healthy agricultural ecosystem.

Transgenic technology mixes genes from biologically unrelated species to create plant traits inconceivable through traditional breeding. Plants have been made resistant to viruses, frost, drought, pests, herbicides, and oxidation—without careful study of possible consequences.

Screen Text of the Movie: The Case Against Monsanto's Transgenic Food..., page 8

The terms "GMO" and "GE" make transgenic corruption of biological integrity seem benign—as if no one need worry about it. They undermine prudence.

Alfalfa's roots bring minerals from deep in the ground up into the top soil, but nutritionally impaired surface soil prevents the alfalfa from getting started ahead of the weeds. The answer is soil improvement, not more use of the same chemicals that caused the problem.

For profit, the cause of the trouble is peddled as the way to fix it.

Like the pharmaceutical industry, Monsanto treats symptoms not causes. When soil minerals are bound up by Glyphosate, they are unavailable to the crops, but they are needed to protect the immune health of the crops and of the people, livestock, and wildlife eating the crops.

Transgenic contamination increases Monsanto's proprietary control. Farmers are controlled through "adhesion contracts" automatically agreed to by opening a bag of Monsanto seeds, and anyone who has a contaminated crop without paying a royalty is liable for patent infringement.

Many farmers do not read the contract terms, but they should discuss them with an attorney.

The control exercised by contract could be the result Stuart Eizenstat hoped for in 1980. That was before Monsanto tested its first transgenic crop, but they were working on the project in 1980.

Transgenic feed impairs animal immune defenses, so antibiotics are used to keep the livestock upright long enough to slaughter.

If public officials are partisans in a tyranny to establish corporate control over the world's food and the growers of it, somebody should launch an investigation—if anyone has the political will, credibility, resources, independent morality, and objectivity to do the job.

Henry Kissinger said 40 years ago, "...if you control food, you control the population." That could be the plan.

The U.S. government promotes transgenic crops and the associated chemicals both at home and abroad without requiring independent research. Officials act as if

Screen Text of the Movie: The Case Against Monsanto's Transgenic Food..., page 9
international public responsibility is irrelevant.

Under the U.S. system, the need for campaign contributions trumps oath of office and corporate interests overrule the public interest.

The U.S. organic program is blind to transgenic contamination if farmers do not know it exists. The program creates an incentive not to know. It is a "process based" standard, so explicit results are not expected, required, or guaranteed. Best efforts are enough.

No "action level" exists to require farmers to find contamination if it is above a set threshold.

If the organic standard on transgenics is not fixed, faith in the organic ideal will be eroded, especially when polling now shows more public concern about transgenic labeling than about organic labeling.

At a minimum, an "action level" like the one governing pesticide contamination is needed.

The National Organic Standards Board is not immune to politics. Members are appointed by the Agriculture Secretary, and for political reasons, appointees from large companies have been favored. They have the money to come to political fundraisers and make contributions.

Corporate players understand the need to use political contributions to protect their interests.

Some companies in the organic industry are part of larger companies with other divisions selling transgenic food. They oppose rules regulating transgenic content in organic food because that could increase demand to address transgenic dangers in non-organic food.

The USDA has served the corporate agenda; no matter which party is in power.

USDA promotion of "co-existence" between transgenic and non-transgenic crops is like putting alligators in the swimming pool with the children. "Co-existence" also assumes transgenic food is valuable, but—
—no independent, objective studies prove it has any value beyond short-term farmer savings on tillage costs and erosion reduction.

Screen Text of the Movie: The Case Against Monsanto's Transgenic Food..., page 10

Transgenic crops have been called "substantially equivalent" to non-transgenic crops, but studies abroad suggest the U.S. claim is willfully negligent, ignorant, untrue, dishonest, or, at best, wishful.

At worst, the claim is profit-seeking malevolence.

The intestines are the center of immune health, and immunity is compromised when the integrity of the gut bacteria is corrupted. In addition, Bt transgenes penetrate the gut wall going directly to the pancreas to affect production of insulin and digestive enzymes.

Also, Roundup Ready transgenes convey their trait to gut bacteria the same as they do to soil micro-organisms. That stops Roundup from killing them, but neither event is valuable.

Polling in 2011 showed 93% of the U.S. people want transgenic food labeled, but the question had to be asked in a way that explained the issue. Without help, many would not have understood the need to know.

53% said they would not eat transgenic food if they could identify it.

Until recently, few have organized to stop politicians from serving Monsanto's interests and the interests of chemically-dependent farmers.

No company should profit from imperiling people and the environment.

The Community Environmental Legal Defense Fund

<http://www.celdf.org>

Transgenic bodily trespass may be worse than radiation in long-term genetic impacts. The damage gets worse over subsequent generations. More studies are needed, but—

Multiple studies abroad show transgenic food is not benign.

People with transgenic food allergies and other transgenic health impacts should not think they have no recourse. Evidence must be gathered and work done to end

Screen Text of the Movie: The Case Against Monsanto's Transgenic Food..., page 11
the health and environmental abuse.

The issue is like past evasion by tobacco companies.

Passive tolerance of transgenic damage does not help.

Please take action to protect yourself and everyone else, including your grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

For more information on transgenic agriculture and transgenic food, please visit:
www.EndTransgenicTrespass.org,
www.PubPat.org/monsanto-seed-patents.htm,
<http://www.OrganicConsumers.org/Monsanto/>, and do Web searching
because the corporate, mainstream media have negligently ignored these issues.