

The Screen Text for the Movie— “What Do You Know About Monsanto?”

Preface

A copy of the 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 is more wonkish than most; it is laden with important detail in a text thread. If this information had been provided in other ways, the film would have needed to be longer than it is, or several films would have been needed to share all of it.

If citizenship is considered important to people on the issues raised, many viewers will have an appetite to understand the level of detail provided, but some may want to skip over some of the screen text or save it for a second viewing of the film later. That is possible the same way a book can be skimmed. The text is provided for those who are interested in all the information required to understand a complex topic. 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 provides time for the practice to happen, 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 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 important in conveying the detail required to gain a broader understanding of the topic. Nonetheless, it cannot cover everything needed to understand

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 2
the larger topic of transgenic food and agriculture. Even viewing all of the available films will leave questions unanswered. They all convey important parts of the story, and they are all needed to help capture the picture.

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 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. “Genetic Roulette” provides more information on the health issues. The URLs to access these films and more can be found at the Web site:
www.EndTransgenicTrespass.org.

To understand all the important details and aspects of the issue more completely, additional 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 everyone’s benefit and the benefit of everyone’s grandchildren and great-grandchildren, people do need invest time in watching more than one film or reading more than one cinematic “brochure.” This is the work responsible citizenship requires of everyone if the future of life on the planet is considered important enough to consider and become informed about.

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 and warming. Not other pollution issues. Not even war and nuclear risks. Especially when the corporate media have so far left the public poorly informed on complex topics like those raised in the lawsuit *OSGATA et al. v. Monsanto*, the labor of becoming informed takes uncommon diligence. We live in complex times, and the work of running a democratic nation is getting more difficult.

Start of the Film (Note it is composed of two 51 minute parts)

Foley Square, New York City, January 31, 2012

The day of oral arguments in Federal District Court on farmers' right to court help against Monsanto's transgenic contamination and patent infringement lawsuits.

Farmer plaintiffs, supporting organizations, and seed companies want to protect

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do You Know About Monsanto,” page 3
the unthreatened right to grow safe, nutritious, healthful, genetically uncorrupted food—free of Monsanto's patented transgenes. So, the question to all citizens is:

What Do You Know About Monsanto

The plaintiffs seek a Declaratory Judgment affirming they have done no wrong when their crops are contaminated by Monsanto's genetically-compromised crops.

"Strict Liability" in patent law allows Monsanto to sue contaminated farmers for possessing their patented product without having paid a required royalty. Pollen drift and other contamination triggers liability.

In 1825, Thomas Jefferson wrote in frustration about:

"...splendid government (by) aristocracy, founded on banking institutions and monied incorporations..., riding and ruling over the plundered ploughman and beggared yeomanry."

Jefferson would be shocked to know the trouble is much worse now.

Under "Strict Liability," it does not matter how the possession happened—

—only the fact of possessing the patented item matters.

"Strict Liability" is a Sword of Damocles over farmer effort to avoid contamination.

The timeline covers the original Monsanto Company and the new Monsanto Company, now a decade old in 2012.

"New Monsanto" was created in 2002 to focus on transgenic agriculture.

In 1996, Monsanto started using their patents to stop seed saving and require annual seed purchase. With this came farm monitoring, harassment by "security contractors," clandestine investigations, patent infringement claims, and lawsuits.

The Center for Public Integrity believes Monsanto has likely caused 56 Superfund sites.

Screen Text of the Movie "What Do You Know About Monsanto," page 4

The oral arguments addressed Monsanto's dismissal motion claiming "no meritorious," "judicial" dispute. The lawsuit is: OSGATA et al. v. Monsanto

Monsanto's attorneys said Monsanto "never sued organic farmers," but they have sued, harassed, bullied, and threatened other farmers growing non-transgenic crops.

The new corn tolerates 2,4-D, one of the two herbicides in Agent Orange. Stronger herbicides are provided because weeds have adapted to Roundup.

Some of the plaintiffs are biodynamic and conventionally non-transgenic. Some are seed companies selling conventional, heirloom, open-pollinated, and other non-transgenic seeds. Many are organic but not all.

Monsanto has touted their ambiguous, non-binding, unenforceable "promise" not to sue farmers over undefined "trace" and "inadvertent," contamination, but the plaintiffs call it "worthless and meaningless."

Monsanto calls the lawsuit "a publicity stunt," but it seeks to protect basic human rights.

Monsanto's transgenic ingredients are in about 75% of "conventional," processed food.

Monsanto has over 20,000 employees with more on contract. A thousand supportive companies are in the biotech trade groups.

In 2011, Monsanto reported revenues of \$11.8 billion and profits of \$1.6 billion. In 2010, they were 197th by revenue on the Fortune 500; yet no independent studies prove their foods healthful or safe.

As of late-2012, 12 new transgenic crops were in the USDA's approval pipeline.

These crops were moved forward under a new "fast track" approval process.

Soon, Monsanto plans to capture 50% of its revenue from developing nations, including India where 250,000 farmers have reportedly committed suicide after they could not repay their seed debts.

They had listened to Monsanto's promise of greater yields, but the promise was not

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 5
fulfilled.

Monsanto controls the Indian cotton seed market through contracts with 60 Indian seed companies.

More about the Indian story is in the film "Bitter Seeds."

When the farmers could not pay their seed debt, their land was taken. It had been signed away as collateral.

This did not happen in the past when farmers could save seeds.

Monsanto's 2011 sales revenues in India were \$750 million. Because of Monsanto's market control, farmers cannot get other seed anymore.

Patents on life are seen as evil.

Beyond cross-pollination, transgenes are spread by contaminated weeds, soil micro-organisms, insects, animals, birds, even rain.

Andrew Faust, Permaculture Teacher and Designer

Having purchased over 70 other seed companies, Monsanto is the World's largest seed company. It also has licensing and contractual agreements with many other U.S. and foreign seed companies. Market domination has been the clear objective.

Transgenic seeds are no better than the non-transgenic hybrid seeds patented transgenes need as a host. Monsanto has bought up so many seed companies and displaced university seed development to get control of the best seed lines.

Monsanto has annually sold about 90% of soy seed in the U.S. market, roughly 85% of the corn, and similar portions of cotton, canola, and sugar-beet seed. All this seed (and more) is transgenic, now with multiple transgenic traits.

Monsanto focuses on major commodity crops for the same reported reason Willie Sutton robbed banks: because that is where the most money is.

So an important question is:

What health damage results from eating Monsanto's "Frankenfood," including the meat, milk, and eggs of animals, poultry, and fish fed patented, chemically-grown, transgenic feed? The film "Genetic Roulette" discusses the health issues in detail.

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 6

Monsanto's transgenic food is officially called "substantially equivalent" to other food and also "safe," but independent, objective, longer-term European studies have found transgenic food is harmful to health and nowhere close to equivalent.

Foreign studies are not replicated in the U.S. because Monsanto uses its patent rights to prevent that. Monsanto also controls research through contracts with the state universities where most U.S. agricultural research is subserviently advanced.

For the sake of everyone's health, public resistance is urged against tyrannous, anti-democratic, patent-abusing Monsanto control over both farmers and food.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan U.S Courthouse, Southern District of New York

Co-Plaintiff Don Patterson of Virginia—

Reporting on courtroom events to a group of New York Quakers after a Vigil they conducted at the courthouse during the oral arguments. "The judge failed to use the event effectively, responsibly, diligently, and without bias," he concluded later.

The plaintiffs believe the judge made grievous legal errors on essential precedent and also neglected or ignored undenied, uncontroverted facts in their complaint.

The lawsuit was filed in March 2011 with 60 plaintiffs and amended in June 2011 with additional information and 23 more plaintiffs. The plaintiffs' attorneys are: Daniel Ravicher and Sabrina Hassan of the Public Patent Foundation (PubPat).

Organic Seed Growers and Trade Association (OSGATA) was invited and agreed to serve as lead plaintiff. They are a non-profit organization protecting organic seed.

The word "organic" in OSGATA's name was deemed helpful in view of the number of organic farmers in the plaintiff group—together with the biodynamic and other non-transgenic, "conventional" farmers, seed companies, and organizations.

OSGATA accepted the lead role after others felt they could not. Some feared retaliation or other possible repercussions if they became visibly prominent.

All of the plaintiffs feel threatened by Monsanto's transgenic contamination and aggressive business practices, including particularly patent infringement lawsuits. Monsanto's security contractors, dealers, investigators, corporate allies, and even customers are feared. Clandestine contamination is feared, as are the dealers who administer Monsanto's "blacklist" against recalcitrant or "uncooperative" farmers.

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 7

The federal government is seen as a Monsanto ally, so government retaliation and prejudice are feared. USDA control over the National Organic Program and other regulatory matters made some unwilling to accept a visible role in the lawsuit.

Time, resources, courage, and assertiveness are needed in advocating on behalf of the plaintiffs, their issues, public health, and the natural environment.

Definition of "Transgenic:"

"A plant or organism with artificially-introduced DNA from a biologically-unrelated species." Bacterial DNA has been injected to create herbicide and insect-resistant crops. Virus, drought, and frost resistant crops have also been created and sold.

"Tearless" onions and Vitamin A yellow rice have been engineered, and the Gates Foundation funded a project in mid-2012 to engineer nitrogen-fixing grains aimed "to save African farmers from buying fertilizer." Gates is a Monsanto shareholder. Herbicide-resistant weeds have caused increased chemical use, and insecticide-resistant insects will also terminate the usefulness of natural pesticides like Bt.

Monsanto's transgenic crops readily cross-pollinate with other related crops. Little research has examined the spread of contamination in the wild now that weeds have taken up the transgenic traits and crops have become feral.

No Monsanto executives have told of eating a transgenic diet to improve their health and vitality. They need to explain—under oath—their own commitment to the nutritional value of transgenic food. None has pounded his chest in ads.

Some farmers growing Monsanto's crops will not eat what they grow. For them, the value is in cost reduction and making farming easy. One said, "Even monkeys could farm with Monsanto's method." The cost-saving comes at high public cost.

At a Monsanto facility in Great Britain, employees demanded no transgenic food be served in the company cafeteria. Perhaps, they knew something others do not. In the U.S., most people still do not know they are routinely fed transgenic foods.

More than 60 other nations label transgenic content in food, and in 2007, Senator Obama said he favored it, but he has taken no action as President—despite 93% of Democrats, 90% of Independents, and 89% of Republicans wanting labeling.

Elected U.S. officials have been AWOL on transgenic food research and labeling. Otherwise, transgenic food would have been independently studied, and either

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 8
banned or labeled. Politician-assisted corporate food control is unconscionable.

The health-neglecting state of U.S. transgenic food research remains unpublicized by the corporate, news-ignoring media—with diversionary government facilitation.

Since 1992, in the face of dissent from FDA scientists, politicians have allowed transgenic food onto the market. Safety testing was left to the companies without government oversight, and laxity has been rewarded with campaign contributions.

Public ethics and morality have died alongside academic and political integrity as people unknowingly eat transgenic food without a right of informed consent.

Three weeks later on February 24th the plaintiffs’ civil right to file their lawsuit was denied by Judge Naomi Buchwald. Her decision was appealed with amicus support from a national group of knowledgeable professors of patent law.

In April, 2011, Monsanto was told the lawsuit would be withdrawn if a binding legal covenant replaced the vague, unenforceable, undefined sham "promise" not to sue for "inadvertent," "trace" contamination. Refusal showed a threat was intended.

"Nonetheless, Judge Buchwald gratuitously, condescendingly, imperiously, and irritably told us to be comforted by Monsanto's phony promise," Patterson says.

"Judge Buchwald basically said transgenic rape is inevitable, so we should relax and enjoy it," Patterson criticizes; "Maybe she has studied neither biology nor the the operating legal realities." He sees "a hostile attitude" in the Buchwald decision.

"Monsanto's 'promise' not to sue is weaselly and useless," Patterson says. "They can interpret it at will, change, or withdraw at any time; nonetheless, the judge reinforced their control over farmers, food, public health, and the environment."

"We are ignored and impugned prisoners of conscience," Patterson charges; "Judge Buchwald's ruling is worse than past decisions protecting Jim Crow laws: Farmers are not 'separate but equal;' they liable and condemned."

"We are denied what Homer Plessy got in 1892: a day in court; Judge Buchwald's ruling is an international disgrace as atrocious as the courts were in Plessy's era," Patterson concludes. "We have a right of appeal, but then, so did Homer Plessy."

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 9

In 1998, British scientist Arpad Pusztai found damage to internal organs, immune system, reproductivity, and growth rate in animals fed transgenically insecticidal potatoes. Prime Minister Tony Blair ordered him fired from his job and discredited.

Benign-sounding product names like Roundup and Lasso paved the way to passive, uncritical chemical acceptance.

Roundup and Roundup-resistant seeds yield half of Monsanto's annual revenue.

Thirty years later, Monsanto reports 250,000 U.S. seed customers.

Glyphosate, Roundup's active ingredient, is a powerful chelator, binding to soil minerals, making them unavailable to nourish the crops and protect food health.

Essential soil fertility is lost along with the ability of the grown food to nourish people and animals.

Glyphosate also gets into the water supply through run-off, fog, and—

—evaporation into rain clouds. So Glyphosate can be distributed anywhere.

Chemically-dependent transgenic agriculture could do more long-term damage than global climate chaos. It makes BP's Gulf oil spill look inconsequential.

A company with a record of irresponsible negligence should not be trusted to safety test its own products.

Monsanto's agricultural system is shamefully efficient at spreading toxic impacts.

This Idaho incident was tiny compared to the environmental and public health impacts of Monsanto's Roundup and transgenic crops.

Fertility damage, birth defects, and other health impacts of Glyphosate use in Colombia are untallied and dismissively denied by the U.S. State Department.

Monsanto has harassed and intimidated farmers to prevent opposing activism and force universal, anti-competitive acceptance of their agricultural domination.

Monsanto's pig project was sold in 2007 to Newsham Genetics in Iowa.

Terminator farm crops have not been commercialized; contamination from them

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 10
could widely spread the terminator trait even among other plant families.

\$572 million was spent by 50 biotech companies from 1999 to 2010 on lobbying and campaign contributions according to Food and Water Watch in 2010. Monsanto's part of the total was \$53 million.

The PAC is only a part of the total political giving. PAC money comes from employees, giving as they might to a United Fund.

Wielding Lobbying Power:

Monsanto reported spending almost \$9 million on lobbying in 2008, mostly to win regulations preventing dairies from labeling milk as "Free of Monsanto's synthetic and transgenic Bovine Growth Hormone (rBGH)." Over \$5 million was spent on lobbying in 2011, mostly to win favorable provisions in the Farm Bill.

Monsanto's lobbying and campaign funding pay off better than other investment expenditures in supporting their farm, food, health, and environmental "rapacity."

Vandana Shiva, Founder of co-plaintiff Navdanya International
Speaking at the University of Virginia in March 2012

Navdanya (Nine Seeds) is a woman-centered, local, sustainable, food and farming movement founded in India but with farming members in many nations, including the United States.

In 1998, Pusztai was leading a taxpayer-funded study examining the safety of transgenic food. He was silenced for six months until the British Parliament launched an inquiry.

Pusztai told of his surprise at the poor quality research sponsored by Monsanto and other biotech companies.

Over a dozen foreign studies show health damage from transgenic food. The Pusztai study was the first. As part of the parliamentary inquiry, Pusztai's right to speak and to access his data were restored.

All of the studies and more should be confirmed and peer reviewed in the U.S. before transgenic food is publicly released, but wise science has been overruled by politics and imprudent deregulatory ideology.

Biotech agriculture is now viewed by some as the biggest error in world history.

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 11

Researchers cannot study Monsanto's transgenic crops without company permission, and release of findings is prevented. Patents enable this control.

In other nations, the U.S. is seen as morally corrupt for disregarding health and ecological damage in favor of monopoly biotech profits.

The public burning of Monsanto's "gift" seed in Haiti after the 2010 earthquake showed the "gift" was seen as a Trojan Horse.

International respect for the capitalist ideal has been weakened alongside trust, admiration, and faith in U.S. morality.

Destruction of the public health and the environment seems to be of no concern as long as business and healthcare profits grow.

Over 7 million are in jail or prison, on parole, or probation), compared to 2,201,000 farms in 2010. One in 150 are farmers in the U.S. compared to 1 in 5 world-wide.

In Bangalore, India in 2011, the International Permanent Peoples' Tribunal put Monsanto and other agri-chemical companies on trial for crimes against humanity, but the proceedings were not covered by the U.S. media.

In some places, the trial was as serious as the Nuremberg Trials at the end of World War II.

As part of the Tribunal's verdict, nations were urged to prosecute the companies for criminality and the charges against them were listed.

U.S. farm policy was originally designed to protect farm income equality, but it has been subverted to:

- push farmers into industrial jobs,
- keep commodity prices low for agribusiness, and
- increase concentrated control over the food system.

Among the cited charges against the companies were more than 300,000 annual deaths around the World from agri-chemical exposure.

The deaths may be viewed as collateral damage—or as population control.

David Zuckerman, Co-Owner and Operator with his wife, Rachel Nevitt, of

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 12

Vermont co-plaintiff Full Moon Farm, a certified organic community-supported farm (CSA); he is a former Vermont state representative and Agriculture Committee chairman, now elected in 2012 to the state senate.

Starting in 1944, Monsanto was a manufacturer of DDT. In 1972, DDT was banned in the United States, but it continued to be sold in other nations.

The patent on Glyphosate expired in 2000, but Monsanto is still the largest seller, because it requires farmers buying its transgenic seeds to buy only Monsanto herbicide. Compliance is monitored.

Roundup and Roundup-Ready seeds have been a destructive recent element of the Green Revolution.

In June 2011, a study of "Roundup and Birth Defects" found damage to frog and chicken embryos from minute Glyphosate exposure.

Farmers considered "uncooperative" with Monsanto are "blacklisted." Monsanto's dealers then deny them the right to buy any Monsanto products, including their non-transgenic and organic seeds.

Some farmers may want or need these seeds because Monsanto now controls many of the best seed lines.

Sister Miriam MacGillis, Operations Director of New Jersey co-plaintiff Genesis Farm, a community-supported biodynamic farm (CSA). As a Dominican sister, she studies and lectures about cosmologically-centered spirituality.

Over 400,000 U.S. Vietnam war veterans have suffered health impacts traced to Agent Orange, and over 500,000 Vietnamese children are reported to have birth defects.

Vietnamese babies are over 130 times more likely to be born with birth defects than U.S. babies. Use of Agent Orange in Vietnam was the largest chemical warfare campaign in world history. It was touted as safe at the time.

Arnold Taylor, Saskatchewan organic farmer and past president of co-plaintiff Canadian Organic Growers with members and chapters in all of Canada's regions.

Both patent law and agriculture need to be sustainable, not just profitable for

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 13
corporations and less costly (over the short term) for chemically-dependent farmers.

Ruth Chantry, Farmer/Co-owner with her husband, **Evrett Lunquist**, of Nebraska co-plaintiff **Common Good Farm**, a certified organic and biodynamic CSA. They also sell through a local farmers market.

The Indian government reports a quarter million farmer suicides since hybrid seeds were first sold in the mid-1990s. The suicides increased with the introduction of transgenic seeds over the past decade.

Nine of the original 83 plaintiffs dropped out of the appeal, so the appellants total 74: 31 organizations, 13 seed companies, and 30 farms or farmers from the U.S. and Canada.

Some plaintiffs may have dropped out of the appeal over a risk of having to pay Monsanto's court costs if the appeal is lost.

Consumers participating in subscription agriculture (CSA) are more concerned about food quality and freshness than typical grocery store customers.

Chuck Noble, South Dakota co-plaintiff and grower of non-transgenic, "conventional" alfalfa; he strongly opposes transgenic crops without being organic.

Buffer zones may help protect self-pollinating crops, but—
—they do not work with crops like alfalfa that are mainly pollinated by bees. Bees travel as much as 3-5 miles from the hive. Entomologists and plant pathologists say all the alfalfa on the continent could be contaminated in about five years.

Marty Mesh, Executive Director of co-plaintiff **Florida Organic Growers and Consumers**. Their certifying organization, **Quality Certification Services**, certifies organic farmers in 30 U.S. states and 14 nations.

In violation of principle long-helping to protect academic freedom in the past—
—faculty members and researchers at land-grant agricultural schools have been silenced, threatened, and even fired for speaking against Monsanto's interests. Monsanto's money is powerful at these schools.

Reportedly, Monsanto maintains a staff of 75 with an annual budget of \$10 million to investigate "piracy matters."

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 14

Monsanto counts on farm neighbors, security contractors, dealers, and private investigators to help them identify "infringers," and voluntary collaborators are rewarded.

Monsanto claims they have never sued, harassed, or threatened to sue farmers not exploiting their technology, but they have done that. "Strict Liability" allows them to deter suits over contamination damage by counter-suing for infringement.

By the end of 2009, Monsanto had filed 136 lawsuits over infringement. Roughly 500 "seed piracy matters" are investigated annually.

The defendants in the 136 lawsuits were about 400 farmers and about 50 small farm businesses. Most of the 500 annual "piracy matters" are settled without going to trial.

The settlement terms prevent farmers from speaking about the details or joining future lawsuits against the company.

Estimated settlement receipts (maximum): \$160 million (the minimum estimate is about half of the maximum). Total recorded court judgment receipts (from 136 cases): \$26 million.

Monsanto uses pre-trial settlement income to provide scholarships for rural students. The publicity about this charity helps them intimidate farmers.

Average recorded court judgment in favor of Monsanto: \$172,000. Largest recorded court judgment: over \$3 million.

Patent infringers may be required to pay treble damages.

One plaintiff said, "People might not oppose Monsanto if they saw benefit transgenic benefits, but people like us see only: • health impairment, • environmental damage, • police state tactics, • threats, harassment, and infringement lawsuits, • pursuit of monopoly and agricultural domination, • failure to fulfill claims, • political corruption, • deception, and • nonsense."

The 2,4-D-resistant corn is a Dow product, but the technology is licensed from Monsanto. Monsanto has a similar corn variety resistant to its Dicamba herbicide, a cousin of 2,4-D.

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 15

Two-thirds of the transgenic crops now in the USDA approval process are resistant to more toxic herbicides. Bt-resistant insects also foretell ever more dangerous insecticides.

All four potato varieties in Europe were susceptible to potato blight. Transgenic dependency similarly limits diversity and increases vulnerability.

Also, Glyphosate binds to soil minerals denying them to the growing crops. The minerals are essential to the vigor, nutritive value, and immune health of the plants as well as to the health of the people and animals eating the crops.

In the U.S., eating has become a slow-motion game of Russian Roulette—

—without appreciation for the sources of essential nutrition and the inability of medicine to replace food.

Modern culture is the first in history to put man-made poisons on and in food before eating it. As if by death wish, chemicals replace traditional agricultural wisdom, and unhealthful, transgenic food adds to the poison.

The idea is promoted as if lower short-term farming costs at high public cost was ever wise, ethical, or honest.

Beth Everett, Nebraska co-plaintiff and certified biodynamic seed farmer.

In May 2012, the Vermont legislature had the votes to pass a bill on transgenic food labeling, but it was stopped when Monsanto allies threatened to sue the state if the law was passed.

Polling shows transgenic food labeling is more important to people than organic labeling, but Monsanto says transgenic labeling is not needed as long as organic labeling exists.

Unfortunately, certified organic food and seed may contain an unlimited amount of transgenic content. Testing is not mandatory, and no action level exists.

This point adds the issue of Glyphosate herbicide contamination (in food) to the health issues caused by transgenic food. (The reference is to a point being made orally by Chuck Noble).

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do You Know About Monsanto,” page 16

Studies in other nations show destructive impact on human fertility as a result of Glyphosate exposure.

Compared with only two CSA subscription farms in the U.S. in 1987, 6500 was a trusted estimate in 2012. In mid-2011, the USDA counted 7175 farmers' markets, a 17% increase over 2010.

But farmers' markets are no better than the skill, soil quality, methods, nutritional diligence, and accountability of the farmers selling produce there.

End of Part I of the Film

Non-Farming and Urban Citizens Report: What They Know about Monsanto Start of Part II of the Film

At nine locations, between February and April 2012, people were asked to answer the film's title question. No one was told the question before the camera rolled.

Transgenic food is an issue in Sweden.

The Objective of the Inquiry:

To survey public awareness, attitudes, and opinions about Monsanto's products, behavior, business methods, activities, and projected values.

Learning the extent of public knowledge about Monsanto is a step toward ending political dysfunction on the need to lower healthcare costs and create a healthful, sustainable farming and food system.

Understanding the level of public knowledge about Monsanto enables assessment of their advertising, public relations, and media management.

The films: "Food, Inc." and "The Future of Food" tell of farmer harassment over unintended possession of Monsanto's patented genes without paying a royalty.

How could so many farmers use Monsanto's products without perceiving the likely damage? Is the role of advertising, lobbying, and the farm press hostile to the public interest? These questions need answers.

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 17

How could so many consumers know little about a subject basic to the preservation of life? Have the media and the government failed them, or have they failed themselves?

Monsanto's share price reached a monthly adjusted closing high of \$119 in summer 2008; then it crashed to about half that price a few months later. The 2008 crash wiped out 18 months of price gains.

During Summer 2012, shares traded above \$80 and trended upward.

Monsanto's subway banner ad showed a farmer saying, "I grow safe food." The only other text was Monsanto's name. Such ads aim to seduce the subconscious.

A democratic nation can be functional only when citizens understand the issues central to their welfare and the morality of their governing relationships.

Food and health issues must be debated by citizens, not just by government officials with biases cultivated by lobbyists and campaign contributions.

Only when citizens can speak effectively in the public interest can they prevent democracy from being dissipated and over-ruled by special interests.

About 150 people were asked the title question on camera. Only about six wanted to know the question in advance, and they were not interviewed. Out of 150, about 100 are in the film.

Monsanto has worked on biodegradable polymers produced by bacteria and plants; this work has been overshadowed by work on transgenic seeds.

The full range of responses is included in the film, but most of the 50 people not included knew nothing about Monsanto. Thus, the film favors people with knowledge.

Even though the large number of uninformed citizens needs to be given a human face, the size of the group is not hopeful for democracy or public health.

Men and women were almost equally informed or not informed.

Men in suits are under-represented. They seemed in a hurry or preoccupied.

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 18

As a group, men in suits might have proved to be more pro-corporate and thus also pro-Monsanto.

Maybe the interviewer needed to wear a suit to attract the participation of suit wearers.

Even those who had never heard of Monsanto often asked what it is.

People did become curious.

Monsanto has sponsored Indianapolis racing cars running on ethanol to promote that fuel.

Monsanto's advertising has aimed at political insiders and farmers, not consumers.

Maybe the lawsuit was J.E.M. Ag Supply, Inc. v. Pioneer Hi-Bred International, Inc., allowing transgenic seeds to receive utility patents. Monsanto was the leading beneficiary of the decision.

The J.E.M. decision was written by Associate Justice Clarence Thomas, who was a Monsanto lawyer in the 1970s.

If citizens are concerned about the food they are fed, they need more knowledge.

Many people seem as trusting as livestock about the food they are provided.

58% of men and 74% of women read food labels, and they average 9 pounds thinner.

Agribusiness food decisions seem to be widely accepted without worry.

Many people also passively accept media decisions about food news. The corporate media provide entertainment and infotainment more than hard news, and maybe citizens want it that way.

Or maybe they have allowed themselves to be led astray.

Monsanto's workers in Hawaii tell of health impacts from the field work they do, but they do not protest because they fear losing their jobs. They suffer in silence.

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 19

Much of Monsanto's crop development is done in Hawaii.

In June 2012, the U.S Senate rejected by 26-73 a Farm Bill amendment allowing states to require labeling of transgenic food. It was opposed by the Biotech Industry Organization and the Grocery Manufacturing Association.

Campaign contributions were likely a major factor in the Senate vote on transgenic food labeling. Many of the "No" voters had received industry campaign donations.

The vote showed political power in the Senate did not serve the public interest. It served corporate interests ahead of the people.

Before being circumvented to serve corporate interests, democracy was a form of intentional community where the errors, ignorance, and abuses of some were—
—everyone's responsibility to fix.

When citizens are not constructively informed and active, the democratic ideal fails and falls into bankruptcy.

This Mexican corn story was published by GM Watch in May 2009.

The title of the story is: "Mexican Corn Contamination: How Monsanto and the University of California Tried to Silence Dr. Ignacio Chapela."

The GM Watch article is on-line as is follow-up discussion.

Even chemical farmers are angry about the costs of Monsanto's agricultural system and its weed and insect resistance.

The power of self-serving corporations has overwhelmed democracy, successfully promoting political dysfunction to advance their own interests.

Functional democracy would seek best answers in service to all, but polarized partisan alienation is a “divide and conquer” strategy for corporate benefit.

Citizens in a real democracy would be stewards of the collective well-being, but the corporate interest favors citizen docility, ignorance, and dependency.

The question is: Should corporations be the servant or the master?

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 20

Small grain farmers have resisted transgenics, so they can sell in nations where transgenic food is rejected.

For chemical farmers, Monsanto's system of agriculture is a form of drug dependency, and the costs are similar to other kinds of drug dependency.

Judge Buchwald needed more information to improve her understanding of agricultural reality.

The judge was found isolated from the health and ecological damage caused by transgenic food and farming, but she ignored facts she was given.

She neglected information necessary to the performance of her judicial duty.

Without more knowledge, she fell victim to false claims, and a breach of justice was the result.

Opposite this man's view, was a student majoring in Science. He told of writing an essay—
—extolling transgenic agriculture.

Then, the student returned to ask that his statement not be used. He feared appearance in a film—
—might endanger his future job options.

To avoid risk, the student opted to hide his views. He did not want to stand up for his views.
He reacted like a fearful citizen of a totalitarian nation.

Everyone should possess an open mind when studying the evidence, but for their own good, they should not delay the investigation.

Wishful biases do not help; too many of them exist already.

Many seem to think people can risklessly improve on nature.

Monsanto feels threatened by transgenic food labeling—and that should raise a red flag for everyone.

In 2012, 51 food corporations and their trade associations contributed \$46 million to

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 21

oppose the labeling of transgenic food in California. The proponents of labeling raised only \$8 million, and most of it came too late to change the outcome; they lost by 2.8%.

In September, 2012, poll favored labeling by 3 to 1, but the corporate campaign began in October.

The corporations clearly believed they could win if they spent enough.

Monsanto bought G.D. Searle in 1985 and merged with Pharmacia & Upjohn in 1999.

After the merger, the firm name was Pharmacia, now part of Pfizer. In 2002, the agricultural business was split off as the new Monsanto Company. It still promotes chemical dependency.

When the new Monsanto Company was created, they must have believed their name had more advantages than disadvantages.

They could have changed their name and left their past legacy behind—as other firms have done.

The movie might have been "Food, Inc." or "The World According to Monsanto."

No objective, independent evidence has shown transgenic food beneficially nutritious or healthful.

Many Monsanto employees have been appointed to government positions, and they have served corporate interests in the government.

At EndTransgenicTrespass.org a list of 35 government officials with ties to Monsanto is provided as a handout.

Monsanto sells transgenic seeds for five major crops: corn, canola, cotton sugar-beets, and soy. In addition, they sell transgenic alfalfa, zucchini, crook-neck squash, and more. Many more are in the pipeline.

Organic soy can overcome transgenic soy allergy, but Monsanto's contamination threat has mostly prevented the growing of organic soy in the United States.

Organic soy can be bought from other nations where transgenic contamination is

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 22
less of a threat.

If people depend on corporate, mainstream media for information, they are poorly served. Those getting news from the Internet are more likely to see stories about transgenic food.

For more on transgenic food labeling see: JustLabelIt.org, OrganicConsumers.org, and other Internet resources.

Now, citizens need to study the provided information and take action.

If Monsanto believed their food is healthful, they would facilitate free public discussion instead of evading it.

Centrally needed is independent investigation of the food safety issues. Honest research could point the to nutritional wisdom. Instead, researchers and research institutions have followed the corporate money at the expense of the truth. The behavior is a national disgrace.

Meanwhile, the government has been no better than Monsanto.

To fix the problem, independent research must replace the biased, industry-controlled research.

The college student afraid to state his pro-biotech views might be a future researcher wanting to follow the money. He might hope for a job at Monsanto.

"I don't know what company you are asking me about." (Translation from Spanish)

Alexis Baden-Mayer, Political Director, Organic Consumers Association.
With the camera rolling, as with everyone else, the film's title question was asked Baden-Mayer.

Main Finding from the Public Survey:

About 90% of respondents knew little or nothing about Monsanto. While some knew about their chemicals, most knew nothing about their seeds.

About 10% of the respondents stated highly critical views about Monsanto.

So the population seems to divide mostly into two groups: the poorly informed and

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do You Know About Monsanto,” page 23
the opponents.

Learned from the Survey:

The state of public vigilance on a matter important to life, health, and the environment.

Few demanded full independent investigation of transgenic food. Even fewer wanted more from civic organizations, corporate media, schools, and government agencies. Change will not come until citizens demand better from others and themselves.

Only one pointed to the close ties between Monsanto and government officials.

None demanded better policy or government integrity to serve the public interest.

In sum, the level of public knowledge is tragic, and much better must be hoped for—if democracy matters.

Nonetheless, only one person favored transgenic food.

Also lacking was strong citizen desire to protect democracy from corporate intrusion, so the people are served ahead of the self-interested and exploitive corporations.

A safe, secure, functional, wise, and admirable democratic nation is impossible if corporations can overpower the public interest while the people watch helplessly.

Horribly, Monsanto’s Roundup binds to the soil minerals needed to grow healthful food. Among these: Chromium deficiency promotes diabetes; Cobalt deficiency impairs the production of Vitamin B-12, weakening human memory.

Pro-corporate political ideology is dogmatic secular religion disconnected from rational analysis and real evidence. It enables democratic dysfunction.

Citizens need to examine the way wealth is concentrated and what it is used for—especially when it morphs into political power. When corporate interests are placed ahead of the public interest, corporate power displaces shared community responsibility.

When corporations are freed by law to put self-interests above the public interest,

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do You Know About Monsanto,” page 24
individuals feel free to exploit the commons the same way corporations do. Those with money do this more powerfully than the poor, but both do it. Morality and public service die.

Amoral freedom delivers democratic self-destruction with Monsanto as one of its agents.

With U.S. law allowing tax deductible, charitable organizations to anonymously raise and spend corporate money for partisan advocacy, the result is alienation, polarization, and elite advantage at public expense. The law becomes an implement of subversion.

Community unity, mutual benefit, and common purpose are all sacrificed.

Self-serving deregulatory ideology allows destructive wealth creation for a minority while the public suffers. More dependency on corporations and increased servitude follow.

The world is now a battleground in a war for political control between legally amoral corporations and the people.

"Bt" is the abbreviation of *Bacillus Thuringiensis*. It was discovered in 1901 by a Japanese biologist, then rediscovered in 1911 by a German, who isolated it as the cause of a disease in flour moth caterpillars.

Bt toxin is not the only risk. Herbicide-resistant gut bacteria also sacrifice health, spreading antibiotic resistant genes. Many health issues have been negligently and irresponsibly swept aside without needed risk assessment.

Again, the movie "Genetic Roulette" digs deeper into the public health impacts of transgenic food.

In July 2012, the Gates Foundation announced a \$10 million grant to develop nitrogen-fixing transgenic grain crops, but this project may not be as benign as the Gates propaganda suggests.

It could be a commercial project launched with tax-free research funding.

Gates Foundation thinks it can beneficially make corn, rice, and wheat fix nitrogen from the air. They show no concern about potentially agonizing, unintended, and unanticipated health impacts.

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 25

Gates owns Monsanto stock, so he could want the Bt gene and the RR gene in the new crops' gene stack.

If independent, objective science, and disinterested rational analysis had been advanced on transgenic technology, the risks of the Gates project might have been assessed before funding was allocated.

If individuals, companies, and foundations are free to contaminate the gene pool, without independent safety testing, the public cannot know about the damage until it shows up in their own lives—and the lives of their children and grand-children. (Studies abroad show the impacts growing worse over subsequent generations.)

A profligately libertarian capitalist model has grown from arrogantly encouraged disrespect for the collective interest. It springs from unregulated, amoral corporate profit pursuit and ignores current and future public costs.

Too much is ignored and disregarded when politicians and corporations promote unconstrained business entitlement to generate unbridled profits and campaign contributions.

The expediencies need to stop; the future of life is in jeopardy.

Patent ownership conveys undisciplined and unregulated power to corporations, with the U.S. Patent Office run as a pro-corporate candy store. Too much is still unknown to tally all the damage, but that should have been learned before any patents were granted.

So-called "credible" academic studies have become anti-democratically exploitive because money and credentialed scientists are needed to make them even when they are bogus. Citizen common sense is impugned as their interests are subverted.

Many scientists have cooperated with this pro-corporate agenda, often in exchange for funding.

Corporate money and political influence take advantage of financially-dependent research institutions, buying an appearance of academic validity corporately-controlled studies would not gain if companies were not politically and financially powerful.

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 26

Independent, objective, unbiased research is found more in nations where morality is stronger. One U.S. academic said, "The U.S. does not need to do all of the research," but this attitude is ethically reprehensible.

Amoral corporate entitlement is strengthened when moral responsibility is outsourced to other nations.

U.S. institutional abdication of ethical and moral responsibility for suppressed, biased, manipulated, inadequate, distorted, and dishonest research needs to be exposed.

The United States should not depend on other nations to determine the truth about U.S. products, promoted by the U.S. government to improve the nation's trade imbalance and increase U.S. corporate profits.

Pusillanimous U.S. irresponsibility has descended into criminality.

Independent, long-term, multi-generational U.S. research should be required before a transgenic food product is released onto the market. Otherwise, the health-destructive impacts will be seen as a means of international population control.

President George H. W. Bush deregulated biotech agribusiness, so Monsanto and others could create unbridled profits and give some of the money back as campaign contributions. Ideology was shaped to increase pro-corporate political and economic empowerment.

Other U.S. Presidents of both parties have also served corporate interests as corporations have become the cash cows of the U.S. political system. As a result, "pay-to-play" has subverted, undermined, and overruled democracy.

With elected officials facilitating increased corporate political domination, many citizens have become alienated against political participation, but politicians have played the anti-democratic game as it has been set up.

The system serves to protect incumbents.

Following service in the Bush-Quayle administration, Michael Taylor became chief lobbyist for Monsanto, and from that position he came to serve as the Obama "Food

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 27

Safety Czar." Forget the Obama promise of change. Money rules, even if many might not want it to.

The terms "GMO" and "GE" make transgenics seem benign. They are pro-biotech terms to be avoided when opposing the transgenic experiment. Sugar-coating soothes the citizens in their role as unwitting, uninformed lab rats.

The terms used to discuss biotech agriculture do matter.

In 2009, critics viewed Michael Taylor's appointment as "putting the fox in charge of the hen house," and Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack was seen similarly, but they are only two of many pro-biotech appointees found to be aiding biotech interests in government positions.

As Iowa governor, Secretary Vilsack was lauded for support of biotech agriculture. He favors pharmaceutical transgenics, and he has been praised by President Obama for his service to the biotech industry.

Pharmaceutical transgenics pose a risk of spreading drug traits into the gene pool.

Many Obama acts, including the planting of transgenic crops in national wildlife refuges, demonstrate administration support for biotech agriculture. But the Obamas eat from an uncertified organic garden on the White House lawn. Thus, they are hypocritical, expedient, or both.

Government officials avoid discussing the healthful safety of transgenic food; that way they can milk the biotech cow for campaign funds as long as possible. Republicans and Democrats have been little different.

Governor Romney has promoted Monsanto but the Romneys also eat organic food at home.

Public views must change before a win in the lawsuit can be assured. Transgenic damage must become clear to people, and public discussion of the issues must expand. That cannot happen when the corporate media forestall the discussion.

Judge Buchwald's lawsuit dismissal protected Monsanto's technology, finding organic, biodynamic, and other non-transgenic food unworthy of protection. Change will only happen when citizens demand it.

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 28

Neither political party has required independent, objective evidence on transgenics, and they will not—until citizens insist on getting it.

Chipotle touts the quality of their meat, but unless it is certified organic, it is hard to know what the quality assurances mean. Consumers need to ask all sellers whether transgenic feed is used to raise meat and dairy animals, farmed fish, and poultry. (This is in addition to the issues with transgenic grains, oilseeds, and vegetables.)

U.S. studies must examine foreign and domestic reports of health damage caused by transgenic food. Morally honest people would understand this requirement. (Otherwise, environmental and health damage is shown to be less important than biotech, agri-business, and healthcare profits.)

If U.S. culture cares about anything more than money and profit, behavior must prove it.

Both the handouts and the list of links can be found at:
www.EndTransgenicTrespass.org

The plaintiff's arguments asserted in the lawsuit:

1. Monsanto's patents should be declared invalid; their seeds cause damage and harmful products should not be patented. All asserted benefits are outweighed by high public costs.

The "benefits" are:

- Short-term cost savings for farmers,
- Campaign funding for politicians, and
- Profits for shareholders, all at high public cost.

2. The patents should be declared unenforceable. They have been illegally misused under U.S. law to establish dominating economic advantage through exploitive, monopolistic practices.

3. Claims of patent infringement against non-transgenic farmers are perverse, counter-intuitive, and opposed by centuries of common and codified law.

Patent law gives Monsanto control over farmers and food—along with the freedom to contaminate everyone.

This is transgenic trespass—without informed consent.

4. The contamination of organic, biodynamic, and other non-transgenic farms causes no injury to Monsanto. Those farmers do not want Monsanto's products. Only the contaminated farmers have suffered a loss, so Monsanto should get no royalties or damages.

In sum, the lawsuit allows the ills of Monsanto's transgenic technology to be illuminated and proven in court—with Monsanto able to rebut if they can.

No other unbiased, disinterested avenue of redress is available; the courts are the only place the public interest might be served.

In Place of Film Credits A Protest Against State Food Libel Laws

Laws making it illegal to criticize agribusiness products are widely believed to be unconstitutional, but that does not stop aggressive corporate lobbying and the corporate funding of political campaigns from getting them enacted.

Corporate political power has established virtually totalitarian control over the food system, denying citizens the right of informed consent about food they are provided.

Food libel laws abusively assault First Amendment liberty. They help Monsanto and others destroy farmer capacity to grow optimally healthful and nutritious food.

They keep citizens ignorant about the damage caused by

chemical and transgenic
agricultural dependency.

The liberty to discuss
the safety and quality of food
is more important than anything
the War of Independence
was fought over in 1776,
because food is essential to life.

Unless people are nourished and fully healthy,
they are dysfunctional, maybe helpless,
and after that, little else matters.

Food libel laws exemplify governmental dysfunction.
They terminate the free exchange
of knowledge and opinion essential
to responsible, admirable, healthful,
just, honest, accountable, wise, and intelligent
democracy.

The thirteen states with
fundamentally totalitarian food libel laws are:
Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho,
Louisiana, Mississippi, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma,
South Dakota, and Texas.

If the legislators in these states
were patriots,
they would repeal these laws
and do many other things
they have not done to protect
and maintain a safe and nutritionally wise
food system.

Food libel laws show
these thirteen states
follow the corporate money
against the interests of the people.

Screen Text of the Movie “What Do Your Know About Monsanto,” page 31

Otherwise, they would want to know
the truth about food
instead of suppressing it.

Please follow your conscience
to shape the rest of the story.

U. S. Supreme Court Building
The East End, Facing 2nd Street N. E.

Timeline of OSGATA et al. v. Monsanto:

January, 10, 2013: Appeals Court "de novo" review of Judge Buchwald's dismissal ruling before Federal Circuit Judges Dyk, Bryson, and Moore in Washington, DC.
Spring 2013: Appeals Court decision expected with possible follow-on request for Supreme Court review if the appellants lose. If or when they win, the lawsuit returns to the Federal District Court to continue where it left off in early 2012.
Meanwhile, public health and environmental damage continues without reprieve.

For more information, see: www.EndTransgenicTrespass.org, www.PubPat.org, www.organicconsumers.org, or Web search on OSGATA et al. v. Monsanto