

DOI: 10.5604/17318157.1216081

GLOBAL LOBBYING OF GMO PRODUCERS

Julitta KOĆWIN*

* *Institute of Economical Sciences, Faculty of Law, Administration and Economics, University of Wrocław
email: jk.biotechnologia@gmail.com*

Received on April 30th 2014; accepted after revision in February 2016

Copyright © 2016 by Zeszyty Naukowe WSOWL



Abstract:

Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) issues evoke extreme reactions. New agricultural biotechnologies using transgenic or genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are being opposed on an exceptionally large scale. The vast majority of opponents want to have at least labels on products that may contain GMOs, while the most extreme of them (particularly in Western Europe) demand the total exclusion of GMO from production and consumption in their countries.

The issues have been publicly discussed for many years – the first GMO came into being over 43 years ago – both sides, not only in Poland, accuse each other of manipulating facts, pursuit of profit without taking consequences into account, as well as hysteria as the response to more and more precise analyses on the influence of GMO on a human organism.

Keywords:

GMO, genetically modified organisms, genetically modified food, Monsanto, genetic engineering

INTRODUCTION

The problem of the food market, especially healthy food, has become a global issue, the solution of which is increasingly affected by transnational corporations that produce food and genetically modified organisms (GMOs), as well as governments as the main actors of the world scene, which support them. There is a clear dissonance on this matter between the United States and the European Union, as both the actors of international relations offer contradictory solutions on the scale of the global economy.

The aim of the presented study was to show that the massive introduction of genetically modified products on the international markets is driven more by a matter of belief, and above all the desire to monopolise the food market and gain above-average profits, than reliable knowledge, analyses and assessment of the facts.

Producers are interested in GM food because of its economic effectiveness, i.e. large profits derived from patents; therefore, they lobby for regulations, which are appropriate and comfortable for them. In support of this assertion the Monsanto Company's activities are presented, as the Corporation oriented purely towards profit, which systematically for years has been destroying the natural environment and aiming to take control of the food market. The interesting research question is how the company was able to launch a number of products (DDT, PCB, dioxane (Agent Orange), herbicides (Roundup), or the recombinant bovine growth hormone), which are harmful and dangerous for humans and the environment. Why does it avoid responsibility, expand its influence and still continue to operate despite criminal convictions? Can such corporations be allowed to impose GMO upon global agriculture?

The main purpose of the article is also to draw attention to the following issues:

- factors determining the development of the market of GM products, as well as consequences flowing from the cultivation and consumption of such foods, i.e. possible effects of the economic use of GM products;
- signalling the problem of large corporations taking over genetic resources, seeds and traditional knowledge of indigenous people living in certain areas;
- for what reasons and in whose interest do the WTO and the US Government support the policy of biotech concerns, especially Monsanto?
- can the Monsanto Company be trusted and are its products actually safe?

Answers to such formulated questions are extremely important from the point of view of the protection of the market of food resources.

1. CODEX ALIMENTARIUS

The validity of the problem under analysis was recognised by the United Nations, which has attempted to solve it by establishing legal norms regulating the marketing of GMOs – the Food Code (the Codex Alimentarius – CA), which is a set of international guidelines and standards on food. 'The Code is a political equivalent of the contemporary toxicological documentations, since it approves and promotes in the international food trade everything including pesticides, irradiation, biotechnology and synthetic alternatives for medicinal substances and nutrients preferring them from natural substances¹.

In 1963 the United Nations (UN) established the Food Code Commission, known worldwide as the Codex Alimentarius. It is a body of the FAO and the WHO, i.e. UN agencies for food, agriculture, health and the world trade. The statutory objective for

¹ Co to jest Codex Alimentarius, stopcodex, [online] Available on the Internet: www.stopcodex.pl/, [accessed on: 24.08.2010].

the creation of the CA was to promote food safety for consumers and fair practices in food trade. About 30 Committees carry out the statutory tasks. Today, the Codex Alimentarius is the intergovernmental organisation consisting of 188 member states.

The Committee coordinates the work carried out by international governmental and non-governmental (INGO) organisations, concerning standards and dietary guidelines. Most non-governmental organisations participating in meetings of the Codex represent the interests of international corporations. These organisations do not hold voting rights, but they may be given the observer status. The Codex is now the most important organisation establishing international standards for the trade in food².

About 300 Codex guidelines and standards are applied by the member states, as a basis for law regulations at regional and national levels, and by the World Trade Organisation (WTO) as a basis for international trade disputes settlement. The Codex has come a long way since setting its initial targets focused around consumer protection by ensuring that food is free from contaminants, such as pesticide residues.

Currently, under the influence of lobby of biotechnology (GMOs), pharmaceutical and medical (reducing competition from increasingly popular and effective natural therapies), chemicals (pesticides and chemical additives) and food (lowering standards of usual and organic food, radiation, chemical additives) industries, it issues official permits to release products containing pesticides, chemical additives, genetically modified organisms, substances containing heavy metals.

This lobby supported by governments affects the determination of legal norms, which are to ensure its control over food and health in the next decades. Implementation of this strategy, however, faces obstacles resulting from the said differences in attitudes towards GMOs that exist between the United States and the European Union. The US government generally supports the marketing of GM products, whereas the European Commission introduces restrictive provisions to the Codex governing trade in goods. The established directives limit the availability of minerals, vitamins, herbs, and change in the treatment of various food products.

Negotiations between the USA and the EU, in which the US government not only supports the producers of GMOs but also accepts the policy of generating threats to the physical and mental health of society, result in introducing subsequent provisions to support this industrial sector, thus depriving consumers of previously obtained rights and freedom of choice³.

The United States' specific support facilitating the marketing of GM products arises, among others, from the support of the Monsanto Company – the international con-

² Globalna kontrola rządów i korporacji nad żywnością i zdrowiem, WOLNE MEDIA, Published on: 29.08.2009, [online]. Available on the Internet: <http://wolnemedi.net/?p=16957> [accessed on: 1.08.2010].

³ Ibidem.



cern (joint stock company) specialising in biotechnology and large organic chemistry geared towards production in agriculture, which has its headquarters in this country⁴.

Activity on the market of genetically modified seed, the production of the bovine growth hormone and aggressive lobbying meant that Monsanto has become one of the most hated by anti-globalisation and ecological activists multinational concerns. In the opinion of anti-globalists, Monsanto is a leading example of the so-called corporate terrorism.

2. THE WTO FAVOURS MONSANTO AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL CORPORATIONS

The World Trade Organisation (WTO) having its headquarters in Geneva started its operation on 1 January 1995 on the basis of the GATT organisational structure. That is an international organisation established in 1994 in Marrakech (Morocco) in accordance with the provisions of the final act of the so-called Uruguay Round (1986 - 1994) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) signed by 23 members of the United Nations⁵.

It was not until the Uruguay Round that agriculture belonged to the areas virtually excluded from international negotiations. However, this topic caused a lot of friction because of the conflict of interests primarily between the United States, which are global food exporter, and the European Union leading the policy of agriculture subsidising and the internal market protection. Rising export and internal subsidies and falling prices on world markets meant that this situation has become difficult for all producers and exporters of agricultural products.

The Declaration of Punta del Este of September 1986 giving rise to following Uruguay Rounds identified their key objectives and main principles of negotiations, the task of which was "...to introduce more discipline and predictability to the world agricultural trade through correcting and preventing restrictions and distortions, also those associated with structural surpluses, in order to reduce uncertainty, imbalances and instability in world agricultural markets". Issues concerning agriculture were among the most contentious during the Uruguay Round. Several times they were the cause of the impasse in the negotiations as well as the extension of the entire Round.

However, the Uruguay Round due to its wide range of topics and the ability to seek a balance for any concessions in the agricultural sector became an opportunity for a breakthrough. The USA and other countries took advantage of that chance. The most important findings of the Uruguay Round, affecting the trade in food, included the following provisions to facilitate the access to the market:

- tariffication – the replacement of non-tariff measures with the customs equivalent without the right to re-enter non-tariff restrictions with the ex-

⁴ Monsanto is also the author of the dubiously titled Terminator Seed - a seed that produces genetically sterile plants at which [The Seed..., [online]. Available on the Internet: www.backtype.com/url/.../00006bba010af71a08da319826143e3f [accessed on: 25.08.2010].

⁵ WTO, [online]. Available on the Internet: <http://www.wto.org/> - complete information in English, French and Spanish, [accessed on: 24.08.2010].

ception of measures taken on the basis of specific provisions of the WTO Agreement (including measures to protect the balance of payments, generally used measures implemented under other safeguard clauses);

- standardisation of all tariffs on agricultural products and their certain, spread over time reduction;
- reduction of amounts of export subsidies;
- lowering expenditure on domestic support of agriculture.

The agreed provisions were reflected in the letters of the commitments of individual WTO members, and gave rise to changes in the multilateral system for regulating trade in agri-food products. The essence of the provisions adopted in the framework of "the Agreement on Agriculture"⁶ was included, among others, in:

- Article 13 ("peace clause") ordering to refrain from initiating proceedings within the WTO forum against the effects of subsidies permitted under "the Agreement on Agriculture";
- Article 15 confirming the principle of special treatment in the negotiations for developing countries, which were given the opportunity to receive smaller concessions and prolong their implementation;
- Article 20 guaranteeing the continuation of the process of changes in the regulations on agricultural trade by starting new negotiations before 2000.

It should be noted that the intergovernmental conference in Punta del Este, which went down in history as the Uruguay Round had a decisive impact on the fate of the GATT, including the term of its validity, as well as on the statutory objectives of the WTO, the implementation of which was subordinated to the interests of the United States.

It was decided on the eighth and final series of intergovernmental trade negotiations, lasting until 1994 during which the US government managed to consider four additional domains, previously regulated only at the level of individual countries.

The first one was the agriculture, followed by investments, services (telecommunication, transport, etc.) and the intellectual property right⁷. The representative of the Washington justified the inclusion of the latter – as the most interesting one – domain in the negotiations by the fact that "in the past year, nearly 200 US companies operating internationally were deprived of a total of \$ 24 billion of revenues from copyright, because of the weakness or a lack of intellectual property protection in some countries⁸", as reported by the development made by the University of Québec.

⁶ Porozumienie w sprawie rolnictwa, the Official Journal of the European Communities, 23.12.1994, L 336/22 (106 PL Official Journal of the European Communities 11/Vol. 21).

⁷ M-M. Robin, Świat według Monsanto, Łódź 2009, p. 456.

⁸ M. Badro, B. Martimort-Asso, N. K. Ponce Morales, Les enjeux des droits de propriété intellectuelle sur le vivant dans les nouveaux pays industrialisés: le cas du Mexique, Continentalisation, "Cahiers de recherche", Vol. 1, no. 6, August 2001, p. 8; quoted after: M-M. Robin, Świat według Monsanto, op.cit., p. 456.

The introduction of new areas within the scope of the matters governed by the GATT, which was originally a simple customs agreement, marked the beginning of another, lengthy negotiations covering issues that went beyond the sphere of trade⁹.

The founding act of the WTO included 29 agreements related to various fields, allowing for the subjection of all goods and services to the rules governing the market – and thus their transfer into the competence of private companies.

As a result, their adoption made governments and citizens lose the ability to control the areas traditionally remaining in the field of public policy. Relations between these sectors and trade are not so obvious that signatories of the agreements had to hide the problem by adding the phrase "in cases where it is connected to trade". This applies particularly to the TRIPS Agreement¹⁰, the shape of which was largely influenced by a coalition of businesses clustered around the Intellectual Property Committee (IPC), including main representatives of the biotechnology industry.

The IPC was created in March 1986 in the United States and represented thirteen transnational companies, stemming mainly from chemical, pharmaceutical and information sectors: Bristol-Myers, DuPont, FMC Corporation, General Electric, General Motors, Hewlett-Packard, IBM, Johnson & Johnson, Merck, Wizer, Rockwell International, Warner Communications and Monsanto¹¹.

One of the basic objectives (the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), an annex to the agreement on the establishment of the WTO of 1994), was to establish international principles prevailing for governments, the WTO members, to protect the intellectual property rights of certain member states of the WTO as well as their citizens and businesses operating within them.

The article 27.3(b) is problematic in pursuing this idea, as it establishes a clause according to which patents could cover the inventions connected to plants and animals.

The purpose of the TRIPS Agreement became a rule that the patent obtained in the United States, for example by Monsanto, was automatically in force worldwide. When analysing the development of the international system of patent law, it can be noticed that it consistently follows a trail marked out by the US government in Washington. Because after the signing of the TRIPS all countries must act in accordance with the model in force in the United States, under the threat of serious trade sanctions, since the WTO has coercive measures on command and possibilities of the use of harsh repression. For example, if a country does not respect the intellectual property rights, for example related to Monsanto's patented seeds, then this international company re-

⁹ M-M. Robin, Świat według Monsanto, op.cit., p. 456.

¹⁰ The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) constitutes an annex to the agreement on the establishment of the World Trade Organisation (WTO). The TRIPS Agreement, signed in 1994, provides the application of the principle of equal treatment of entities from all member states of the TRIPS, the protection of intellectual property (entities from other member states are to be treated no less favourably than their own ones).

¹¹ M-M. Robin, Świat według Monsanto, op.cit., p. 457.

quests a response from the US government that submits a complaint to the Arbitration Panel (Dispute Settlement Body) of the WTO¹².

The TRIPS Agreement and its principles were inspired by transnational companies so that they could take possession of genetic resources of the planet, especially of the Third World countries that retained the greatest biodiversity. (The main objective is India, a country called "mega-diverse" – there it was counted at least 45,000 species of plants and 81,000 species of animals).

It should be noted that the world of living organisms is not the domain of the WTO, because it is subject to the Convention on Biological Diversity signed in 1992 in Rio de Janeiro, under the auspices of the United Nations. The Convention recognised by 200 countries states that genetic resources are the exclusive property of particular countries, which have the duty to protect them and to ensure equitable sharing of benefits arising from practical application of traditional knowledge, which is associated with them. However, the TRIPS cannot be reconciled with the Convention on Biological Diversity, since their texts contradict each other. For this reason the United States did not sign the Convention of Rio. The reason was the fact that the TRIPS Agreement is considered superior to the Convention, because it is guaranteed by the WTO favouring transnational companies such as Monsanto, which actually subject the world market to themselves while maintaining the semblance of liberal global trade¹³.

Anti-globalists have alleged that the WTO is not a democratic institution, but it only serves the interests of multinational corporations. Thanks to it foreign investors gain a number of concessions and privileges in the country in which they invest capital. Favouring foreign economic operators leads to the collapse of local producers and traders, who are not able to withstand the unfair competition, as well as the economic and political dependence on foreign countries, i.e. Western ones, as they have strong, expansive capital, developed economy, etc.

Besides, when it comes to safeguarding the interests of Western countries, the WTO can reach for command-and-control methods. An example is the recent case of the Polish poultry farmers who protested against the import of poultry from countries where the production of poultry is subsidised. In response they heard that its imports follows the Poland's commitments towards the WTO, and therefore cannot be stopped¹⁴.

Another group of objections concerns the negative consequences of the globalisation, i.e. the elimination of domestic workplaces as a result of the collapse of uncompetitive enterprises and deepening of development disparities. There are also arguments raised that the WTO does not care about the environment.

¹² Ibidem, p. 461.

¹³ Ibidem, p. 461-462.

¹⁴ Wolnościowa krytyka globalizacji ekonomicznej, the Anarchist Information Centre, [online]. Available on the Internet: cia.bzzz.net/wolnosciowa_krytyka_globalizacji_ekonomicznej [accessed on:1.08.2010].

3. GMO

The issue of GMOs is inseparable from the globalisation, which creates certain consequences for the world trade in agricultural products. Today, four multinational concerns exercise control over almost the whole transgenic seed material in the world. Therefore, the area of special concern is the exclusive monopoly of these companies and associated decreasing importance of individual countries towards the growing role of business¹⁵.

The big American biotech companies have secured the favour of next US administrations to recognise GMO products to be safe and promote them on global markets. The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) declared GMO products to be identical with their natural counterparts without any tests on humans and animals involved. Any attempt to raise objections to this approach, supported by analysis of the side effects of the use of GMOs, taken by the FDA employees were suppressed by their superiors and pressure "from the top", as it posed a threat to the US national interest.

Regardless of this pressure, the Department of Chemistry and Food Technology of FDA identified four potential risks associated with GM food, i.e.:

- the increased concentration of known naturally occurring toxins;
- the emergence of new, unknown toxins;
- the tendency of plants to absorb greater amounts of toxic substances from the environment, such as pesticides or heavy metals;
- adverse change in the amount of nutrients.

The Department warned that if GM crops are not tested for these changes, which may be overlooked by manufacturers, they might bring unknown threats. Therefore, it recommended a thorough examination of each variety before it is allowed on the market¹⁶. However, despite repeated warnings about the possible threats arising from the use of genetic engineering in food production, scientists' theses were removed from the further FDA's statements¹⁷.

Many FDA officials authorising GMOs on the market sooner or later worked for producers of the admitted varieties of plants. Currently in the world there are a lot of studies showing that GMOs cause a lot of disastrous consequences for ecosystems and consumers. Irrespective of the fact, the Americans continue to promote GMOs as a way to solve food problems of the world and make the other regions and countries subject to suppliers of patented GMO products, including grain of the type *terminator* not giving any harvest¹⁸.

¹⁵ P. Kossobudzki, Spokesperson for PAN, Jak rzetelnie informować o GMO?, [online]. Available on the Internet: http://64.233.183.104/search?q=cache:nnmpD-ILd7wJ:gmo-eko.net/referaty/kossobudzki.doc+GMO+sonda%C5%BC&hl=pl&ct=clnk&cd=2&gl=pl&lr=lang_pl [accessed on: 1.08.2010].

¹⁶ J. M. Smith, Nasiona kłamstwa, Poznań 2007, p.144.

¹⁷ Ibidem, p.145.

¹⁸ Globalna kontrola rządów i korporacji nad żywnością i zdrowiem, op.cit.

GMO products are an excellent business for the big biotech concerns, such as Syngenta, Monsanto and Aventis, which produce seeds and patent genetically modified plants and thus make the global agriculture addicted to them. GM seeds from own harvest cannot be used, but they have to be compulsorily purchased from the producer. It is a tactic to subjugate farmers¹⁹.

The aim of this procedure is to concentrate the food market in the hands of one company – Monsanto, that is to maintain a monopoly on food, and it does not matter what the GMO is like. In the USA, agriculture is completely monopolised by Monsanto. Poland has time to prevent it. The only approved in the European Union for the cultivation a variety of GMO is the Monsanto's MON810 maize. In Poland, the research has been conducted on the new variety NK603 resistant to the Monsanto's herbicide "Roundup Ready". After the GMO cultivation has been authorised the process of approving new varieties will probably be accelerated.

It can be assumed that if someone wants to eat GM products, he/she should not be forbidden from purchasing them, because it is his/her free choice. But what is grown on the Polish fields should belong to the Polish farmers, not the Monsanto Corporation. Not a single company but the free market should decide on food prices. In the USA, Monsanto raises prices, which could lead to a food crisis²⁰. Now Monsanto controls approximately 90% of GM crops (the estimated value). It may be higher taking into account the continuous increasing of Monsanto's influences.

Production of GMO has nothing to do with food security, as emphasised by biotechnology companies, its sole purpose is to increase the income of Monsanto, which managed to impose their law of patent claims almost all over the world. The company has always maintained that genetic modification is a means to obtain patents, and that is what its aspirations have come down to. When intellectual property rights of GM seed are imposed as a norm, Monsanto will gain the possibility of charging patent fees. Any sown seed, each cultivated field will be dependent on it. It should be added that if it controls seeds, it also controls the food, which the best way to control societies around the world²¹.

4. OPERATION STRATEGIES OF BIOTECHNOLOGY COMPANIES

Companies producing genetically modified seeds are the owners of the patents for those plants and sell their seed for higher prices (3 to 4 times, but sometimes up to 1000 times) than the usual grain. They make farmers believe that buying the grain will bring them benefits, promising higher yields and the reduced need for spraying. They

¹⁹ J. Wojciechowski (Member of the European Parliament, Vice-President of the Agriculture and Rural Development Committee), GMO - cywilizacyjne zagrożenie (12.07.2007), PPR.pl The Fiest Agriculture portal, [online]. Available on the Internet: <http://www.ppr.pl/artukul.php?id=138383#no3> [accessed on: 1.08.2010].

²⁰ Czy polski rząd sprzeda się międzynarodowej korporacji?, wykop.pl, [online]. Available on the Internet: <http://www.wykop.pl/link/422789/czy-polski-rzad-sprzeda-sie-miedzynarodowej-korporacji/> [accessed on: 1.08.2010].

²¹ M-M. Robin, Świat według Monsanto, op.cit., p. 452.

encourage farmers to contract credits for the purchase of modified seeds and specialty chemicals for the protection of genetically modified crops. In addition, they demand technological charges and royalties for the use of their "intellectual property", i.e. genetically modified seeds, plants and animals.

Under the agreement, which a farmer has to sign, he/she is not the owner of plants that grow on the field and after harvest he/she is not allowed to re-sow a part of the collected seeds. This makes farmers dependent on biotech concerns and forces them each year to buy new seeds and licenses for their productions as well as bring in technological charges for the use of modified seeds. Biotech companies illegally patent also the traditional plants, those that for thousands of years have been grown in countries such as Georgia, India and Amazonia. Once, for example in India there were cultivated thousands of varieties of rice with specific taste and health characteristics. Today, most of them are patented by multinationals, and only some varieties are permitted for the cultivation²².

One of the major arguments of biotech companies has become the promise of saving the world from hunger. However, today the overproduction of food is seen in the world. The key problem is not a small amount of food, but its inappropriate distribution and poverty. Most undernourished children live in countries where there is the overproduction of food. One example is India, where 320 million people are starving, despite the fact that India has in reserve 65,000 tons of food in stocks. What is more, India exports food, since the poor cannot afford to buy it. With such a large overproduction, farmers often do not have the ability to sell their products at prices that provide them the possibility to maintain. This is because the large-acreage farms are able to reduce the price of food production so significantly, that an ordinary farmer cannot survive on the market.

Banks and biotech companies urge farmers to take collateral loans against the land. In the case of crop failure or changes in purchase prices, farmers are not able to repay them. In this way, at least one million farmers in the United States, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, India and many African countries were deprived of the land and any chance of a decent life.

The adequate distribution of goods should be ensured so as to overcome the cause of hunger. Farmers must be provided with the disposal of their products, and the starving with the possibility to get a job and earn for the purchase of food. Meanwhile, large corporations deprive the starving from such opportunities²³.

The example of how biotechnology fulfills its promises to rescue from hunger is the case of Iraq. The country has been occupied under the pretext of combating terrorism since 2003. Besides the obvious reason for acquiring local raw materials they have been trying to make this country a paradise for huge free trade. The part of this plan is

²² Tomekgo, GMO i Monsanto, 19 Grudzień 2009, portal: Oczy szeroko zamknięte, [online]. Available on the Internet: <http://oczyszerokozamkniete.wordpress.com/2009/12/19/gmo-i-monsanto/> [accessed online: 1.08.2010].

²³ Ibidem.

to bring the Iraqi model of the food production convenient for GM seeds and plants. Agricultural industry giants have granted permits for that in the context of rapidly introduced orders called "Bremer Laws"²⁴.

They imposed surprising changes: unlimited import without customs duties, inspection and taxes, dispensing with any control. The usage of traditional seeds threatens heavy fines and even imprisonment. Only those patented seeds that are genetically modified and are the property of the biotech industry giants are allowed for usage. Farmers are prohibited from re-sowing the seeds. Thus, for over 20 years the owners of patents have been given the absolute power over farmers using their seeds. Farmers have to pay technological and annual license charges.

The basis of this ordinance is the American Act of Law "The Protection of Plant Varieties", owing to which the seeds of GM plants have been protected and received the right to eliminate varieties of plants grown in agriculture for 10 thousand years. While the Iraqis are starving, biotech giants are leading production aimed at export. The forced transformation of Iraq's food production towards the patented GM crops is the visible example of how the United States and its industry make other countries produce modified food. There is nothing to do with saving the world from hunger²⁵.

5. THE MONSANTO CORPORATION – THE SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES

The Monsanto Company (a company operating since 1901, the development of which took place in the 1930s and was associated with the sale of saccharin for Coca-Cola) is an international group specialising presently in biotechnology and organic chemistry directed towards the agriculture production, as well as the world leader in the production of the herbicide, glyphosate, which under the trade name "Roundup" is the flagship product of this concern.

Monsanto is also the leader in the production of genetically modified seeds, thereby controlling from 70 to 100% of the market. Agracetus, a company with 100% of its

²⁴ Part of the plan of the GMO agricultural industry giants was to obtain unfettered control over this sector of the economy and radical adjustment of the Iraqi food production to the model convenient for GMO seeds and plants. These companies received consent within one hundred quickly introduced regulations known as "Bremer Laws". The Iraqis had nothing to say in the matter, because their country is now ruled from Washington. Bremer Laws imposed the most severe "shock therapy" in the style of the Chicago School, which had been destroying countries around the world since its inception in 1973 in Chile under the rule of Pinochet. The formula was known: massive redundancies of workers employed by the state, counted in hundreds of thousands, not limited import without duties, taxes, inspections or fees or, renouncement from any control, the plan of the biggest sell-off and privatisation of the state since the fall of the Soviet Union. Taxes for corporations were reduced from 40 to 15%. Foreign investors were granted the right to own 100% of Iraqi assets, with the exception of oil, could also transfer all of their profits without taxing and the obligation to reinvest in Iraq. What is more, they have been awarded 40-year petroleum production licenses. (More: Zasięgnienie destruktacji part 2, 4 AUGUST 2009, IGYA SEKRETY ZDROWIA, [online]. Available on the Internet: <http://www.igya.pl/wszystkie/437-zasiew-nasion-destrukcji-2.html> [accessed on: 1.08.2010]).

²⁵ Genetycznie zmodyfikowane organizmy GMO - nowe zagrożenie dla ludzi, przyrody i ekonomii, portal: OTWÓRZ OCZY, [online]. Available on the Internet: <http://otworz-oczy.org/index.php/genetycznie-zmodyfikowane-organizmy-gmo-nowe-zagrozenie-dla-ludzi-przyrody-i-ekonomii/> [accessed on: 1.08.2010].

shares owned by Monsanto, enjoys the exclusive right to produce genetically modified soybean sold under the name "Roundup Ready". In March 2005, Monsanto acquired Seminis Inc., which made it a market leader in the conventional seed²⁶.

The activity on the market of genetically modified seeds, the production of the cow growth hormone and aggressive lobbying meant that Monsanto has become one of the most disliked and controversial multinationals.

Food produced using the Monsanto technology is often termed *frankenfood* (from Frankenstein and food), and the name the group is changed into *Monsatan*. According to the anti-globalists, Monsanto is an example of the so-called corporate terrorism.

Monsanto is now the biggest food provider of the USA, a company that has produced poisons for decades. In the mid-80s the Monsanto Corporation from a chemical giant transformed into a food giant. In 1982, Monsanto scientists were the first to genetically modify a plant cell. The multi-billion dollar industry of genetically modified food was created (GMO) on the basis of the Monsanto's seeds. The flourishing of the company was possible due to the decision the US Supreme Court, which in 1980 allowed for the patenting of living organisms. The case did not concern the GMO seeds, but the bacteria developed by General Electric for oil spill cleanups, but served a precedent for the acquisition of agricultural production by corporations²⁷. Controlling the food market gives corporations the power to dictate food prices and decide what people eat.

Currently, Monsanto presents itself as "the agricultural company" but for half a century was a record-holder in the chemical poisoning of the planet and its inhabitants.

In the 1980s due to the new technology, which was then the genetic modification of food, Monsanto wanted to develop and patent a completely new species of food. The company intended to buy grain from producers all over the world, so as to introduce own, patented genetically modified varieties in the place of natural products²⁸.

In the early 1970s the Monsanto's Management came up with the idea of producing a strong herbicide and creating a plant that would be resistant to it. This way Roundup and modified corn were created. A farmer buys both products, sows corn in the field corn and sprays Roundup destroying everything that grows there apart from corn, which without the competition of other plants brings high yields.

In this way, Monsanto makes the farmer dependent on its products. The farmer pleased with the high corn harvest signs a license agreement prohibiting him/her from collecting seeds from last year's crop, forcing him/her to the annual supply of seeds from Monsanto²⁹.

²⁶ Monsanto, [online]. Available on the Internet: <http://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monsanto> [accessed on: 25.08.2010].

²⁷ M. Jarkowicz, Żywność Masowego Rażenia, "Przekrój" 12/2010, 1.04.2010, [online]. Available on the Internet: http://www.przekroj.pl/wydarzenia_swiat_artykul,6546,0.html [accessed on: 1.08.2010].

²⁸ J. M. Smith, Nasiona kłamstwa, op. cit., p.139.

²⁹ M. Jarkowicz, Żywność Masowego Rażenia, „Przekrój” 12/2010, op.cit.

Monsanto systematically eliminates traditional seed market by taking over their producers. This is evidenced by the two most important Monsanto's purchases in recent years – the world's largest producer of vegetable seeds – the Seminis Company (2005, for \$ 1.4 billion), and the Delta and Pine Land Company, the tycoon specialising in cotton seeds (2007, for \$ 1.5 billion). As a result of the implementation of such a strategy, the market is running out of seeds over which the concern does not exercise any control.

Monsanto also uses legal pressure against farmers, who do not buy their products. For example, when the seeds produced by Monsanto are carried by the wind and spread on the fields of accidental farmers, the company accuses them of stealing. In this situation the farmer has two options, i.e. he/she enters into a settlement and signs a license agreement with Monsanto, or hires lawyers and begins a long court battle, which ruins him/her before the end³⁰. According to the organisation Center for Food Safety, which has been monitoring Monsanto's activities for many years, most farmers cannot afford a lawyer and tend to go for a deal with the company.

Today, Monsanto is the largest owner of US biotechnology patents. It holds almost 700. It is unrivaled on the US market of the genetically modified maize, cotton, sugar beets, rape, alfalfa and soybeans. In the latter case – it controls 90% of sales. Given the fact that almost three quarters of processed foods – which most Americans eat – is genetically modified, one can imagine how enormous Monsanto's influence on their diet is³¹.

One should be aware that the word "patent" is associated with the era of conquest and comes from the Latin *litterae patentes*. At that time the patents were official, explicit documents, affixed with royal or government seals and granted corsairs with the exclusive right to conquer foreign lands on behalf of the authority, which had issued it. When Europe was colonising the world, patents were tools of territorial conquest, while today the award of this type of license is to facilitate economic conquest. Thus, the principle has remained unchanged. Today, transnational companies of the Monsanto type practise it through the appropriation of living organisms³².

Patents covering plants for feeding and treating people ultimately lead to deprive the poorest of the funds for living and surviving. In the case of seeds or drugs, at the moment when the exclusive right is confirmed, patent charges appear, which means higher prices³³. The imposition of the Western system of intellectual property rights, as proposed by the World Trade Organisation and which previously was pushed by the United States in the framework of the last round of GATT, directly reduces the economic rights of the poorest³⁴.

³⁰ Ibidem.

³¹ Ibidem.

³² M-M. Robin, Świat według Monsanto, op.cit., p. 454.

³³ Ibidem, p. 455.

³⁴ Ibidem, p. 455-456.

5.1. Low-quality products of Monsanto

The Monsanto Concern, which is a leading biotech corporation, is the perfect example that we should not uncritically believe in assurances of corporate experts. During the 100-year history of Monsanto its specialists have always claimed that the new technologies applied are completely safe. After years it turned out that they had been wrong³⁵.

In 1929, specialists of the Monsanto Company invented polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), used in the production of electrical insulators, which over the next decades were widely used mainly as liquid insulators in transformers and large capacitors. Toxic PCB oil, also known as *Pyralene*, was over the years produced in Anniston, Alabama (the USA) and thousands of tons of waste were thrown anywhere. It soon became apparent that they were highly toxic, caused cancer and reproductive problems in animals and humans, and congenital disorders in children. There were poisoned 18,000 people, many of whom died.

The Monsanto concern was sentenced to pay \$ 700 million compensation, but people still succumb to cancer and disabled children are born. Although *Pyralene* was withdrawn from production in the 1970s (since 1977 it has been banned in the USA because of carcinogenic properties), millions of tons of PCB are in the environment, build up in the adipose tissue of living organisms and moving along the food chain *Pyralene* poisoned the waters of the Rhine, and was detected in polar bears. In the EU, it can be used with restrictions³⁶. PCB still remains on the list of substances particularly hazardous for the environment.

In 1945 Monsanto introduced the insecticide DDT – a chlorinated hydrocarbon used to control insects – into the production. It was used since the 1940s to early 1960s. DDT is highly toxic; it causes cancer and accumulates in the adipose tissue of animals and humans. At the end of the sixties of the last century, DDT was banned in developed countries because of its durability and the accumulation in living organisms. In Third World countries it continues to be used to fight mosquitoes transmitting malaria³⁷.

In the years 1962-1970 during the Vietnam War another Monsanto's product, i.e. the defoliant called "Agent Orange", was used to destroy jungle likely to hide the Vietnamese guerrillas. The company assured that their product for controlling plants is safe for humans. However, it turned out that during its degradation toxic dioxins are triggered,

³⁵ A. Buczyński, K. Rytel, RELACJE: Monsanto – największy producent genetycznie modyfikowanej żywności, 2002.01.18, [online]. Available on the Internet: <http://www.zm.org.pl/?a=Monsanto> [accessed on: 1.08.2010].

³⁶ Prawda o Monsanto- genetycznym koncernie trującym, 21 April 2009, Available online: <http://informacje-dla-was.blog.onet.pl/Prawda-o-MONSANTO-genetycznym-2,ID374505840,n> [accessed on: 1.08.2010]; and S. Rieger, Monstrualny świat Monsanto, Text of 14/03/2008, [online]. Available on the Internet: http://www.rfi.fr/actupl/articles/099/article_4027.asp [accessed on: 1.08.2010] and tomekgo, GMO i Monsanto, 19 December 2009, the portal: Oczy szeroko zamknięte, op.cit.

³⁷ Prawda o Monsanto - genetycznym koncernie trującym, 21 April 2009, op.cit.; and tomekgo, GMO i Monsanto, 19 Grudzień 2009, the portal: Oczy szeroko zamknięte, op.cit.

which cause damage to humans' health and which bring about similar effects (number of diseases, including cancer, disorders of the nervous system or birth defects) to PCBs, but with several times lower concentrations. In 1987 veterans suffering from cancer and liver damage received \$ 180 million compensation from the producers of Agent Orange. Approximately half a million Vietnamese children who were born deformed as a result of their mothers' contact with dioxins has not received compensation³⁸.

In 1976 Monsanto launched the Cycle-Safe, the first plastic bottle for drinks. A year later, its production was banned because of carcinogenicity³⁹. However, after several years, the FDA again approved it for use⁴⁰.

In 1985 Monsanto began selling Aspartame (Nutra-Sweet), a sweetener suspected of causing brain tumors, later prohibited in the United States⁴¹. The pharmaceutical company G.D. Searle & Company, finally acquired by Monsanto, started the production of Aspartame as a food additive⁴².

The most popular herbicide, *Roundup*, bringing huge profits for the Company, was touted as "*harmless and biodegradable*". The advertisement, however, was unreliable, for which Monsanto was sentenced before the courts in New York and France. A fine in the amount of \$ 700 million did not come as a serious blow for the Company with the yearly income of \$ 7.5 billion. Therefore, upon expiration of the patent on *Roundup* (after 20 years a patent goes into the public domain and anyone can duplicate it) Monsanto introduced a new product called *Roundup Ready*. Genetically modified varieties of corn, soybean or oilseed rape are now resistant to the universal herbicide that destroys all other organisms with the exception of them. So far, no one has examined how many of the huge doses of *Roundup* accumulate in sprayed seed and reach the cattle feed, and indirectly consumer products. The importance of the problem should be seen in the fact that *Roundup Ready* constitutes currently 70% of the seed offer of Monsanto⁴³.

The strategy of Monsanto's activity, in which the most important is profit, not the quality of the product offered, despite having been proved the launch of numerous faulty products endangering lives and the environment of human, remains continually unchanged. In the 21st century, the continuation has been confirmed by the newly marketed products, such as BST (rBGH, Posilac) – the recombinant (genetically modified) bovine growth hormone increasing cow milk production. Due to the increased susceptibility of cattles to infection (associated with the increased milk production), they receive higher doses of antibiotics.

³⁸ Prawda o Monsanto - genetycznym koncernie trującym, 21 April 2009, op.cit.

³⁹ Ibidem.

⁴⁰ Tomekgo, GMO i Monsanto, 19 December 2009, portal: Oczy szeroko zamknięte, op.cit.

⁴¹ Prawda o Monsanto - genetycznym koncernie trującym, 21 April 2009, op.cit.

⁴² Tomekgo, GMO i Monsanto, 19 December 2009, the portal: Oczy szeroko zamknięte, op.cit.

⁴³ S. Rieger, Monstrualny świat Monsanto, The text of 14/03/2008, op.cit.

Initially, no direct impact of rBGH on humans was found⁴⁴. Later, it turned out that it increased the risk of breast, colon and prostate cancers in people drinking the milk⁴⁵.

The use of BST is not allowed in Canada, and since 1 January 2000 it has been banned in the European Union⁴⁶. It was proved that stimulation of the milk production causes the epidemic of infectious diseases requiring the mass application of antibiotics, which are indirectly transferred to consumers⁴⁷.

A similar issue is the aforementioned product *Roundup Ready* containing a gene increasing plants' resistance to the herbicide *Roundup*. Its application on an industrial scale in crops of maize, soybeans, rape, cotton and sugar beets resulted in the appearance of weeds, which came from uncontrolled crosses tolerant to *Roundup*. Currently, farmers have to use higher doses of herbicides, which means the increased use of chemicals and higher costs of crops (and much higher profits for Monsanto)⁴⁸. It should be added that the terminator gene patented in the USA prevents plants from natural reproduction (it causes sterility of seeds), making the farmers dependent on the annual supply of grain for sowing from Monsanto⁴⁹.

Numerous disasters and technological mistakes appearing over the years in the production process, which reached a wider public, did not damage the Company's reputation. The most known of them can include among others⁵⁰:

- Monsanto's factory explosion in Texas City in 1947, which destroyed a part of the city killing 500 people;
- after the research in 1979 the Company claimed that dioxins did not increase the risk of cancer. In 1990 it turned out that the results had been falsified;
- in 1986 the Concern issued \$ 50 thousand to prevent the adoption of law banning the placing carcinogenic chemicals into drinking water sources in California;
- in 1990 Monsanto issued \$ 405 thousand to block another legal initiative aimed to reduce the use of pesticides, including carcinogenic alachlor;
- in 1997 it was revealed that the company sold to Companies producing fertilizers 6,000 tons of waste contaminated with cadmium;
- on 19 May 2001 Monsanto revealed that genetically modified soya *Roundup Ready* contains "unexpected genetic fragments". The genetic material found had got there while creating the variation and had been present in it before

⁴⁴ Tomekgo, GMO i Monsanto, 19 December 2009, the portal: Oczy szeroko zamknięte, op.cit.

⁴⁵ Prawda o Monsanto - genetycznym koncernie trującym, 21 April 2009, op.cit.

⁴⁶ Monsanto, Available on the Internet: <http://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monsanto>, op.cit.

⁴⁷ S. Rieger, Monstrualny świat Monsanto, The text of 14/03/2008, op.cit.

⁴⁸ Prawda o Monsanto - genetycznym koncernie trującym, 21 April 2009, op.cit.

⁴⁹ Ibidem.

⁵⁰ Ibidem.

the Company was authorised in 1992 in the United States in 1996 in the UK. Scientists from Monsanto concealed this fact for a long time.

5.2. Political protection of the Monsanto Concern

In the light of the cited analyses and cited opinions the fundamental question arises what factors determine that the Company has not only remained on the world market, but also has been leading the dynamic expansion. When seeking the answer to this question the hypothesis must be accepted that its economic position on the global food market is directly dependent on the support of the US government, which treats trade in food as one of the factors that influences other countries. This conclusion can be drawn indirectly from the strategy of Monsanto, the aim of which is to take control over the production and marketing of food throughout the world. In accordance with the principle: who controls the food, has the power.

Monsanto, which has taken over half a hundred of seed companies, now dictates its economic principles in 46 countries around the world, controlling 90% of the market of genetically modified seeds.

Sources of that domination should be sought in the amazing synergy between the interests of the company and the policy of the US administration. Another Bush and Clinton administrations uncritically supported offensive biotechnology, because the Monsanto's strategy is perceived by them as a new way to "colonise the world". It must be assumed that the political support of successive governments of the United States was not one-sided process, because it was repayed with the economic support of politicians seeking to take public functions.

The words of James Maryanski confirm such formulated opinions; until 2006 he directed the department of biotechnology in the government control agencies FDA, *Food and Drug Administration*, and he said that the decision to legalise GMO was purely "political", not scientific. Similarly Dan Glicksman, the agriculture minister in the government of Clinton, admitted that he was under constant pressure so as "not to formulate exaggerated demands" regarding testing and expertises, which transgenic discoveries should undergo.

Scientists undermine the propaganda of Monsanto – for example the biologist Arpad Pusztai, whose laboratory in Great Britain was closed after he had detected suspicious effects of GMOs in rats, or the French Professor Bellé, who pointed to the possible carcinogenic properties of *Roundup* – became the objects of harassment and discrimination. The former Clinton's Minister of Labour, Robert Reich wrote in his latest book, that money – that is all-powerful *lobbying* on the part of large corporations – destroys the remnants of democracy.

Monsanto managed to infiltrate all decision-making instances. The inspirer of the completely liberal rationing of genetically modified organisms was Michael Taylor – firstly Monsanto's lawyer, later a member of the government FDA, responsible for biotechnologies, and then again in the Monsanto Company as the vice president⁵¹.

⁵¹ S. Rieger, *Monstrualny świat Monsanto*, The text of 14/03/2008, op.cit.

Therefore, in the light of these facts further questions should be asked: How does the biotech industry affect governments? How does it still dictate to the governments of the United States the policy, despite serious and overt violations of the law committed in the past?

The answer to these questions lies certainly in the financing of political campaigns. In the years 1995-2000 the four giants of biotechnology – Monsanto, Dow, DuPont and Novartis (now Syngenta) – issued more than \$ 3.5 million on electoral commissions, projects and a lot of private fundings, three-quarters of the money, went to Republicans⁵².

The President of Monsanto, Robert Shapiro was one of the biggest sponsors of Clinton's election campaign in 1996. Shapiro was then a member of the presidential Advisory Committee for the Trade Policy and Negotiations, and worked for some time in the National Audit Committee at the White House⁵³.

The biotech industry also benefits from another tool for lobbying. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, in the years 1998-2002 the industry spent \$ 143 million on lobbying, including the Biotechnology Industry Organisation (BIO), which lobbies and organises advertising campaigns on behalf of the entire industry. According to news agency Associated Press of June 1995, BIO had a budget of \$ 30 million, 70 employees and represented the interests of thousands of companies. BIO was accused by the National Right to Life Committee (National Committee of the Law) of exerting undue influence on legislators⁵⁴.

It should be emphasised that Monsanto is the Concern that spends most money on the lobbying activity of the US government. The Company lobbied, among others, the US Congress, the US Department of Agriculture and the Environmental Protection Agency. The aim of the lobby was to convince officials to alleviate the rules on GM crops, other issues related to agriculture, the genetically modified food-related patent rights in the USA, as well as the principles of the cultivation of such foods.

Patent issues are very important to Monsanto because the Company develops and sells patented genetically modified crops. The use of Monsanto's patents has been examined by the US Department of Justice. It is questionable whether Monsanto violated antitrust laws by holding patented genes under the strict control⁵⁵.

According to the website OpenSecrets.org (tracking practices of corporate lobbying), in 2011 Monsanto spent more than \$ 5 million on lobbying the US government. In 2010, this sum amounted to \$ 8 million and in 2009 - \$ 8.6 million. However, the record year

⁵² J. M. Smith, *Nasiona kłamstwa*, op.cit., p.158.

⁵³ *Ibidem*, p.159.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, p.159.

⁵⁵ Monsanto spent \$2.46 million lobbying gov't in 1Q, The Associated Press, Available on the Internet: <http://www.businessweek.com/ap/financialnews/D9GFL8780.htm> [accessed on: 4.02.2016].

was 2008, when \$ 9,000,000 was spent for bribes and lobbying activities⁵⁶. There is no information how much Monsanto spends on lobbying in Poland.

The development of research on GMO food is a top priority for Monsanto; therefore lobbying for appropriate and convenient patent rights is a strategic objective the achievement of which will bring huge profits from GMOs in the future.

In order to ensure a favourable legal system governing the production and marketing of food, companies that produce GMOs have been trying not only to place people supporting their activities in the government, but also affect the personnel policy in favour of their politicians. Nowadays, the food industry lobby controls all key for themselves offices and positions in Washington. These are held by, among others⁵⁷:

- Tom Vilsack, the Secretary of Agriculture. Until recently – the Chairman of the Agreement of Governors for Biotechnology (as the Governor of Iowa), the organisation lobbying for GMO and cloning farm animals, a regular passenger of private jets of the Management of Monsanto.
- Islam Siddiqui, the Chief Negotiator of Agriculture (the office dealing with the sales abroad of US agricultural products). Until recently – the Vice President of the CropLife Coalition associating biotech giants (with Monsanto at the head).
- Roger Beachy, the Head of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (scientific research on food). Until recently – the President of the paid by Monsanto plant research center Danforth.

In the Department of Agriculture and in all offices connected with food industry people can be met who in the recent past held key positions in corporations controlling the market.

The position of the agri-food industry in Washington was strengthened by \$ 1.2 billion spent in 2000-2010 on lobbying the Congress and the White House. With this money the number of cases of meat inspection declines each year. Also thanks to it in the United States it is not necessary to inform consumers on labels whether the food is genetically modified or whether the cows that gave milk had had the artificial hormones injected. Producers of hormones (including the largest one - Monsanto) have been conducting the struggle to be allowed not to inform people that milk comes from cows fed with hormones. Under the current regulations, if a producer wishes to inform the recipient, the information must be put on the label that the well-known study has proved that milk with hormones is equally good⁵⁸.

With the money allocated to lobbying, the GMO industry has effectively destroyed the definition of ecological (organic) food. While retaining the awarded by the government

⁵⁶ Firma Monsanto wydała 2 mln dolarów na lobbing, Available on the Internet: <http://www.ekologia.pl/wiadomosci/srodowisko/firma-Monsanto-wydała-2-mln-dolarow-na-lobbing,16415.html> [accessed on: 31.01.2016].

⁵⁷ M. Jarkowicz, Żywność Masowego Rażenia, "Przekrój" 12/2010, op.cit.

⁵⁸ Ibidem.

stamp *organic*, now substances that enhance taste and smell, raising agents and artificial fats can be added to food, as well as plants, which are fertilised and transported from the other end of the world can be used.

This should be explained by the fact that the organic industry is currently worth \$ 23 billion each year and is developing faster than other food sectors. The most popular brands of organic food belong to the following giants: Nestlé, Kraft and Coca-Cola. Healthy food has been bought by corporations and ceased to be healthy. As a result of "the legal corruption", as often lobbying in the USA is called, there is no public debate on GM food. In the corporate and political offices it has already been decided that it is safe and can save humanity from hunger⁵⁹.

During the five years the industry spent \$ 250 million to convince the public that GM food is valuable⁶⁰. Since it has been produced, it must be sold, and this is what marketing specialists deal with. The industry sector spends \$ 36 billion per year on advertising, including \$ 13 billion for the message aimed at children. Of course, the USA is not the only country where food production has been industrialised. But nowhere else a few powerful entities hold so strong control over what people eat⁶¹.

Only personal connections play a greater role in gaining support than lobbying, funding political activities or advertising campaigns. According to "The New York Times", Monsanto maintains close contacts with legislators, particularly trade negotiators. Mickey Kantor, the former Secretary of the US Department of Commerce, was a close friend of Robert Shapiro, the President of Monsanto. When Kantor was the representative of the US trade under Clinton's administration, the US trade was characterised by the strong strategy, which favours biotechnology, towards markets throughout the world. The US officials publicly and contemptuously called the concerns among European consumers "the products of conservative minds unfamiliar with science." This trend continues to dominate in American trade policy⁶².

In March 2003, the President of the Parliament J. Dennis Hastert attacked European, in his opinion "protectionist and discriminatory trade policy towards GMO", which he called "the duty-free barrier based not on science but on fear and speculations⁶³".

Mickey Kantor after leaving the government became a member of the Management of Monsanto. Another member was also William Ruckelshaus, the former manager of the EPA. Another former employee of the EPA, Linda Fisher, was Monsanto's Presidents of Government and Public Affairs; then she returned to the EPA as the Vice President. Lidia Watrud, the former biotechnologist from Monsanto was transferred to the Laboratories of Environmental Effects of the EPA. In turn, in the FDA, two former employ-

⁵⁹ Ibidem.

⁶⁰ J. M. Smith, *Nasiona kłamstwa*, op.cit., p.159.

⁶¹ M. Jarkowicz, *Żywność Masowego Rażenia*, "Przekrój", 12/2010, op.cit.

⁶² J. M. Smith, *Nasiona kłamstwa*, op.cit., p. 159.

⁶³ Speaker Hastert Calls for End of European Union's Protectionist, Discriminatory Trade Policies, U.S. Newswire, 26 March 2003; quoted after J. M. Smith, *Nasiona kłamstwa*, op.cit., p.160.

ees of Monsanto, along with Michael Taylor, led to the approval of the recombinant bovine growth hormone, a product of Monsanto, which no other industrialised country in the world has considered safe for the cows and consumers of milk⁶⁴.

Monsanto moves in the maze of the Washington bureaucracy thanks to Marcia Hale, the Director of International Affairs of Monsanto. Hale was also the assistant to the US President and the Director of Intergovernmental Affairs. Josh King, the former Director of the Event Organisation at the White House went to Monsanto for the position of the Director of Worldwide Contacts⁶⁵.

Other examples: David W. Beier from Genentech became the Chief Advisor on National Policy in the office of Vice President Al Gore. Clayton K. Yeutter, the former Secretary of Agriculture and a representative of the American Chamber of Commerce came to the Management of Mycogen. L. Val Giddings, the Vice President of BIO, was one of the negotiators of legislation on biotechnology and environmental safety in the Department of Agriculture. Terry Medley, the Director of Legal and Outer Affairs in Dupont; he sat in senior positions in the Department of Agriculture and the FDA⁶⁶.

The highest politicians in the George W. Bush's administration in the years 2000-2004 also had strong ties to the biotechnology sector. Ann Veneman, the Secretary of Agriculture was a lawyer in a company that supported the interests of biotech companies. She sat also in the Management of Calgene Incorporated, which is now a subsidiary of Monsanto. The Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld was the President of another Monsanto's company: Searle, the creator of the sweetener aspartame produced through genetic engineering. Mitch Daniels, the Director of the Management and Budget Office, was the Vice President of Eli Lilly Pharmaceutical, which together with Monsanto created rBGH. Tommy Thompson, the Health Secretary, received \$ 50,000 from biotech firms during his campaign for the governor of Wisconsin. Being the governor, from the state funds he organised in Wisconsin the biotechnology zone worth \$ 317 million. John Ashcroft, the Public Prosecutor General received most money from Monsanto during the election campaign in 2000. The President of the Supreme Court Clarence used to work at Monsanto as a lawyer⁶⁷.

CONCLUSION

The answer to the question formulated in the main thesis of the article concerning the lack of Monsanto's responsibility for the introduction of a number of dangerous products is obvious, since the Company spends annually a lot of money on lobby addressed mainly to the US government. Generally, the basis for the legalisation of GM crops and food is multi-year skillful lobbying consisting in the exchange of views between the government institutions and Monsanto as well as the absolute support of the US government for biotechnology as the exceptionally profitable and competitive sector of

⁶⁴ J. M. Smith, *Nasiona kłamstwa*, op.cit., p.160.

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, p.160.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, p.160.

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 160-161.

industry. Lobbyists ensured not too much complicated legal procedures and made the legislative process based on the theory of "interchangeability" of traditional and transgenic varieties.

Genetic engineering was supposed to be the driving force for development, provide the solution to world hunger, reduce the use of pesticides or cure civilisation diseases, although in the present form it can lead to the loss of control over the food market, as in fact it gives corporations the power to begin to control food. In addition, genetic engineering, which modifies plants and animals so as to patent them later, contributes to the control of the food production. These companies are beginning to decide what people will eat and dictate how much they will pay for the food. The good example is the American food industry, where a small number of large buyers (e.g. McDonald's, Burger King, Wendy's) take control over the meat market in the USA. Such control allows these networks to dictate prices paid to farmers for meat and affects the conditions of animals' well-being and labour standards. Similarly, supermarkets in developed economies around the world increasingly control the food market, affecting the suppliers, what is grown and bred, how it is processed and packaged. Their influences reach deep into the lives and livelihoods of farmers around the world. The situation is particularly serious in Australia, where the two retailers: Coles and Woolworths control 70% of the domestic food market.

The development of science and technological progress is not possible to be stopped. However, the basic principles of ethics and morality must be preserved when using their achievements. Also adequate education is necessary. One should be aware that the changes could not be reversed. All the solutions offered by modern science should not be accepted unreservedly, because the acceleration of evolution leads to unforeseen negative consequences for the environment.

For the time being the European space is free from major risks arising from the use of GM products. However, it should be noted that the European Commission has not still established methods and research, which will require the registration of GMOs. It is alarming that under pressure from the United States it began to allow them to use, which may lead to their release into the environment. This decision evidences the lack of respect for law and the basic principles of logic because if organic farming will be contaminated by GMOs it is no longer organic.

This also applies to the Polish government that until now has been resilient to the introduction of GM products for cultivation on a larger scale. It must be borne in mind that if the Polish government allows genetically modified plants it will kill organic farming. This situation will hit primarily in small and medium-sized family farms in Poland, specialising in organic and integrated farming. So far Polish healthy food has been very well perceived on the international markets. Customers are willing to buy it, because it is healthier and tastier than what their native producers offer. When Polish food becomes contaminated by GMOs Poland will lose huge markets for its food, and the society will be forced to consume food "that kills"⁶⁸.

⁶⁸ Tomekgo, GMO i Monsanto, 19 December 2009, the portal: Oczy szeroko zamknięte, op.cit.

It is to be feared that the policy of the European Union, like of the United States, favors certain groups of interests and related officials, who also want to take control over the market of food and health. The EU law and international issues of protection against the effects of GMOs is not a rewarding topic for the media chasing the daily sensation or controlled by the capital employed in industries associated with genetically modified food. It is also not an easy subject for politicians more involved in the construction of their image than in a substantive discussion.

REFERENCES

1. Badro M., Martimort-Asso B., Ponce Morales N. K., *Les enjeux des droits de propriété intellectuelle sur le vivant dans les nouveaux pays industrialisés: le cas du Mexique*, Continentalisation, "Cahiers de recherche", vol. 1, nr 6, August 2001, p. 8.
2. Buczyński A., Rytel K., *RELACJE: Monsanto – największy producent genetycznie modyfikowanej żywności*, 2002.01.18, [online]. [available: 01.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: <http://www.zm.org.pl/?a=monsanto>.
3. *Co to jest Codex Alimentarius*, stopcodex, [online]. [available: 24.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: www.stopcodex.pl/.
4. *Czy polski rząd sprzeda się międzynarodowej korporacji?*, wykop.pl, [online]. [available: 01.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: <http://www.wykop.pl/link/422789/czy-polski-rzad-sprzedzie-sie-miedzynarodowej-korporacji/>.
5. *Firma Monsanto wydała 2 mln dolarów na lobbing*, [online]. [available: 31.01.2016]. Available on the Internet: <http://www.ekologia.pl/wiadomosci/srodowisko/firma-monsanto-wydała-2-mln-dolarow-na-lobbing,16415.html>.
6. *Genetycznie zmodyfikowane organizmy GMO – nowe zagrożenie dla ludzi, przyrody i ekonomii*, portal: OTWÓRZ OCZY, [online]. [available: 01.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: <http://otworz-oczy.org/index.php/genetycznie-zmodyfikowane-organizmy-gmo-nowe-zagrozenie-dla-ludzi-przyrody-i-ekonomii/>.
7. *Globalna kontrola rządów i korporacji nad żywnością i zdrowiem*, WOLNE MEDIA, 29.08.2009, [online]. [available: 01.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: <http://wolnemedi.net/?p=16957>.
8. Jarkowiec M., *Żywność masowego rażenia*, „Przekrój” 12/2010, 1.04.2010, [online]. [available: 01.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: http://www.przekroj.pl/wydarzenia_swiat_artykul,6546,0.html.
9. Kossobudzki P., Rzecznik Prasowy PAN, *Jak rzetelnie informować o GMO?*, [online]. [available: 1.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: http://64.233.183.104/search?q=cache:nnmpDILd7wJ:gmo-eko.net/referaty/kossobudzki.doc+GMO+sonda%C5%BC&hl=pl&ct=clnk&cd=2&gl=pl&lr=lang_pl.
10. *Monsanto*, [online]. [available: 25.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: <http://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monsanto>.

11. *Monsanto is also the author of the dubiously titled Terminator Seed - a seed that produces genetically sterile plants at which* [online]. [available: 25.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: www.backtype.com/url/.../00006bba010af71a08da319826143e3f.
12. *Monsanto spent \$2.46 million lobbying gov't in 1Q*, The Associated Press, [online]. [available: 4.02.2016]. Available on the Internet: <http://www.businessweek.com/ap/financialnews/D9GFL8780.htm>.
13. *Porozumienie w sprawie rolnictwa*, Dziennik Urzędowy Wspólnot Europejskich, 23.12.1994, L 336/22 (106 PL Dziennik Urzędowy Unii Europejskiej 11/t. 21).
14. *Prawda o MONSANTO - genetycznym koncernie trującym*, 21 kwietnia 2009, [online]. [available: 1.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: <http://informacje-dla-was.blog.onet.pl/Prawda-o-MONSANTO-genetycznym-,2,ID374505840,n>.
15. Rieger S., *Monstrualny świat Monsanto*, 14.03.2008, [online]. [available: 1.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: http://www.rfi.fr/actu/pl/articles/099/article_4027.asp.
16. Robin M-M., *Świat według Monsanto*, Łódź, Biblioteka Obywatela, 2009, ISBN 978-83-926008-3-1, s. 452, 454-457, 461-462.
17. Smith J. M., *Nasiona kłamstwa*, Poznań, oficyna wydawnicza 3.49, 2007, ISBN 978-83-85290-16-2, s. 139, 144, 158-161.
18. *Speaker Hastert Calls for End of European Union's Protectionist, Discriminatory Trade Policies*, U.S. Newswire, March 26 2003.
19. Tomekgo, *GMO i Monsanto*, 19 Grudzień 2009, portal: Oczy szeroko zamknięte, [online]. [available: 1.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: <http://oczyszerokozamkniete.wordpress.com/2009/12/19/gmo-i-monsanto/>.
20. Wojciechowski J. (Poseł do Parlamentu Europejskiego, Wiceprzewodniczący Komisji Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi), *GMO - cywilizacyjne zagrożenie* (12.07.2007), PPR.pl Pierwszy Portal Rolny, [online]. [available: 1.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: <http://www.ppr.pl/artukul.php?id=138383#no3>.
21. *Wolnościowa krytyka globalizacji ekonomicznej*, Centrum Informacji Anarchistycznej, [online]. [available: 1.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: cia.bzzz.net/wolnoscowa_krytyka_globalizacji_ekonomicznej.
22. *WTO*, [online]. [available: 24.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: <http://www.wto.org/>.
23. *Zasiew nasion destrukcji cz.2*, 04 sierpnia 2009, ygya sekrety zdrowia, [online]. [available: 1.08.2010]. Available on the Internet: <http://www.igya.pl/wszystkie/437-zasiew-nasion-dest-rukcyj-2.html>.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Julitta KOĆWIN, DSc, Eng. – doctor of economic sciences, assistant professor in the Department of Economic Policies at the Faculty of Law, Administration and Economics

of the University Wrocław. She specialises in the issues of capital investments and banking, as well as external financing SME enterprises. She has conducted research on contemporary economic problems.

HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER

Koćwin J., (2016). Global Lobbying Of Gmo Producers. *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższa Szkoła Oficerska Wojsk Lądowych im. gen. Tadeusza Kościuszki Journal of Science of the gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko Military Academy of Land Forces*, 48 (2), p. 62-86, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5604/17318157.1216081>



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY).
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

