

Promoting “Healthy” GMO Food. Agri-Business’ “Anti-Organic” Campaign

By [Tony Cartalucci](#)

Theme: [Biotechnology and GMO](#)

Global Research, September 09, 2012

[Land Destroyer](#)

Anti-organic “study” is not news, rather, coordinated propaganda campaign.

Harry Wallop of the London Telegraph ends his [anti-organic food editorial](#) with the following sentence:

“Tomorrow, the baby is going to get an extra dollop of pesticide-sprayed carrots.”

Whether or not Wallop is as brain-addled as he leads on to being, the point of his editorial is to encourage similar attitudes amongst the Telegraph’s readership, attempting to manipulate public perception in the wake of a recent Stanford “study” regarding organic food.

Whether or not readers of the Telegraph will put their own health and that of their children at risk for the sake of protecting big-agri’s bottom line and the faltering paradigm that big-agri products are safe for human consumption simply because Harry Wallop thinks its good to feed his baby with pesticide-sprayed carrots remains to be seen.

The London Telegraph, when not fabricating news to support England’s latest imperial adventures overseas, is at the forefront of many of the largest corporate-financier funded lobbying campaigns. Recently, someone has splurged, and splurged big on anti-organic food lobbying built atop a suspect Stanford study.

A Flawed “Study”

When entire news cycles are dominated by headlines built on a single university study, with editorials attempting to hammer in big-agri talking points, a lobbying effort is clearly afoot.

Two news cycles have already been dedicated to trashing organic food. Organic food is free of pesticides and genetic manipulation, both of which are proven to cause learning disabilities, decreased IQ, sterility, and a myriad of other health problems including a wide variety of cancers.

This most recent anti-organic food campaign began with [a Stanford study](#) out of [its Center for Health Policy](#) (a subsidiary of Stanford’s Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies), examining the nutritional value of organic food versus non-organic. Food with pesticides on it had nearly the same nutritional value, the study claims, as organic food – completely skipping over the whole point of eating organic.

Indeed, the nutritional value would be similar – but the entire point of eating organic is not

because of vastly superior nutritional value, but to avoid the “extras” included with products from big-agri corporations.

The Stanford study intentionally dismisses concerns regarding the presence of pesticides by simply claiming levels were within legal tolerances. No discussion was made on whether legal tolerances equated to safe tolerances, nor was there any mention made of the harmful effects of genetically modified organisms (GMO) or other controversial food additives found in non-organic food products.

So why the strawman argument?

A Corporate-funded “Study”

The Stanford Center for Health Policy states the following [on its own website](#):

“The Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies (FSI) relies on support from its friends, as well as from national and international foundations and corporations, for the funding of the Institute’s research, teaching and outreach activities.”

The Center for Health Policy is a subsidiary of the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies (FSI). So who are these “friends,” national and international foundations and corporations funding the research of FSI and its subsidiary, the Stanford Center for Health Policy?

FSI HEALTH POLICY CENTER FOR HEALTH POLICY/ CENTER FOR PRIMARY CARE AND OUTCOMES RESEARCH

FSI CENTERS & PROGRAMS RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS PEOPLE EVENTS NEWS ABOUT US

Search CHP

Search within: Everything

More information

Neil Penick
Associate Director for Development and External Relations

The Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies (FSI) relies on support from its friends, as well as from national and international foundations and corporations, for the funding of the Institute’s research, teaching and outreach activities. Annual unrestricted gifts are especially essential to the director’s ability to respond quickly and appropriately to compelling opportunities. For more information about making a gift to FSI, please contact:

Neil Penick
Associate Director for Development
100 Encina Hall
Stanford University
Stanford CA 94305-6055
Phone: (650) 723-6681
Fax: (650) 723-7543
email: npenick@stanford.edu

Annual gifts of \$25 and up can be made online to support FSI Stanford. These gifts provide unrestricted support for crucial programs and secure the institute’s ability to respond quickly and appropriately to research proposals addressing emerging environmental, economic, and security threats around the world.

If you’d like to make your gift online using credit card, please go to **Giving to FSI Stanford**. To designate FSI (or one of the centers or programs here), please select “Other” on the first pull-down menu. Then on the second page, “Further Designation,” you may type FSI (or one of the centers or programs) in the “Special Instructions/Further Designation” box.

Gifts to FSI are tax-deductible under applicable rules. The Institute is part of Stanford

Image: From Stanford Center for Health Policy’s [own website](#) it is admitted that “national and international foundations and corporations” fund its research and “outreach activities.” This confirms the suspicions of an increasingly aware public who saw the “study” as biased, contradictory of both logic and ethics, and the result of insidious corporate-funding.

....

According to FSI's 2011 Annual Report ([page 38, .pdf](#)) Agricultural giant Cargill, British Petroleum (BP), the Bill & Malinda Gates Foundation ([heavily invested in both Cargill and big-agri giant Monsanto](#)), the Ford Foundation, Google, Goldman Sachs, the Smith Richardson Foundation, and many other corporate-financier, Fortune 500 special interests.

FSI Donors

The Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies gratefully acknowledges the following individuals, foundations, and corporations for their generous support during the 2010-2011 fiscal year. Gifts received between September 1, 2010 and August 31, 2011 are listed below. Every effort has been made to provide an accurate listing of these supporters.

Anonymous (12)	Dodge & Cox	Andrew Jenkins Hazelton
Herbert L. Abrams	Maia Penelope Draper	Steven and Christine Hazy
Adobe Systems, Inc.	William H. and Phyllis Draper	Martin Edward Hellman
Tarek AbuZayyad	Gloria Duffy and Rod Diridon	Benjamin Hewlett
Richard Baer and	Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI)	(The Flora Family Foundation)
Janis L. Ahmadjian-Baer	Siri Eliason	William & Flora Hewlett Foundation
Jacques Ansebi	David and Arline L. Elliott	Ingrid von Mangoldt Hills
Minoru S. and Anne Atraki	Stuart Ross Epstein	(Edward E. Hills Fund)
AUS of McGill University	L. M. Ericsson Company	Laurie and Gaye Hoagland
Gregory and Anne Avis	Karl Essig	Industrial Technology Research Inst
Richard Lawrence Baer	ETLA	Elizabeth and Eric T. Jacobsen
Barbro Osher Pro Suocia Fdn	Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation	(Elizabeth and Eric T. Jacobsen
Felicity Barringer	Laura Chen Fernandez	Foundation)
William A. and Sigrid Bergenstrin	Thomas and Orlene Fingar	Elizabeth and Robert Jeffe
David and Anne Bernstein	Justine Beth Fisher	William Allen Joseph
Best Buy	Sakurako and William Fisher	Yasunori and Yumi Kaneko
Monika B. Bjorkman	Joan Butler Ford	W. M. Keck Foundation
BP Foundation	Margit Forsberg	Lawrence and Patricia Kemp
Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation	Bradford M. Freeman	Anne and Loren Kieve
Greyson Lee Beyan, Jr.	The Freeman Foundation	Marjorie B. Kiewit
Steven John Buckley	Ulf Gallstedt	Jennie Kim
Belinda M. Byrne	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	Jeong and Cynthia Kim
Cargill, Inc.	Diane and Paul Gerber	Koret Foundation
Carnegie Corporation	German Stanford Association	Joan Robertson Lamb
Caterpillar, Inc.	GlobalGiving Foundation	Anne H. Lamont
Amy and Ping Chao	Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.	David and Susan Lampton
Eric Ken Chen	Google, Inc.	Joan Lane
Nelson Chen and Margaret Wong	John and Lola Grace	Gail Warshofsky Lapidus
Zhengzheng Chen	(Gifted Learning Institute)	Chien Lee
Edward and Louisa Cheng	Sandra J. Graver	(Bei Shan Tang Foundation)
James Clive Chesnut	John and Cynthia Gunn	Margaret Lee
Karin Fahlman Chesnut	Hallin Trust	(Lee Shaw Kee Foundation)
Michael and Jenny Choo	James and Priscilla Halper	Lee Foundation
Suh-Yong Chung	Phil and Maurine Shores Halperin	William Ranney Levi
Peter and Lisa Cirenza	(Silver Giving Foundation)	Douglas and Virginia Levick
Cisco Systems, Inc.	Robert and Ruth Halperin	Susan and Bernard Liautaud
Simone and Tench Cox	Katharine Hanson and Peter Kaplan	(Liautaud Family Foundation)
Louis J. Cubba	Maurice and Carol Harari	Richard Lim
Cyrus Chung Ying Tang Fdn.	Harry Harding, Jr.	Nina Lin
Alan and Laurie Dachs	Howard E. Harris and Sally C. Sieber	Anders Linkvist
Dell, Inc.	William N. Harris	Alexander Shih-Wei Liu
Steve and Roberta Denning	(Myrtle L. Atkinson Foundation)	Los Alamos National Labs
Kenneth M. deRegt	John R. Harvey and Sarah Mendelson	Albert and Rose Marie Lowe

36

DONORS FSI

Image: From Stanford's 2011 FSI Annual Report (page 38, .pdf), of which the Center for Health Policy is a subsidiary, is funded by Cargill, the Bill & Malinda Gates Foundation ([heavily invested in both Cargill and big-agri giant Monsanto](#)), and a myriad of other Fortune 500 corporate-financier special interests. The report at face value is throwaway propaganda, but its funding reveals a more insidious, coordinated effort to manipulate public perception, stretching across academia, mass media, government, and big business. (click image to enlarge)

....

That none of this is mentioned, and the lack of independence and transparency involved in the study and its presentation to the public, overturns the credibility of both Stanford, and the Western media machine that so eagerly shoveled the results out to the public.

Combined with the fact that the study itself is flawed, and the concerted, disingenuous nature with which it is being promoted to the public, a premeditated public relations campaign, bought and paid for by Stanford's FSI sponsors, most notably Cargill and the Bill & Malinda Gates Foundation is self-evident.

What to Do?

Quite obviously, one should continue eating organic. Additionally, the duplicitous nature exhibited by academia, the mass media, and the vast corporate interests overtly driving them both, demands from us to redouble our efforts at implementing [full-spectrum boycotts](#) aimed at big-agri as well as other [Fortune 500 corporate-financier monopolies](#). This includes other processed food makers such as [Pepsi and Coca-Cola](#), Kraft, and the myriad of subsidiaries they maintain.

We should also redouble our efforts at supporting local farmers, attending and contributing to local farmers markets, and investigating the possibility of growing, if only a small percentage, our own herbs, fruits, and vegetables.

Freedom and self-determination come from economic independence, self-reliance, [and self-sufficiency](#). The most fundamental form of economic independence is having a safe, secure, and local food supply operated for, by, and of the people. Cementing this emerging paradigm, in spite of the crass, juvenile, even criminally irresponsible editorials like that of the Telegraph's Harry Wallop, and multimillion dollar "studies" subsidized by Cargill and the Bill & Malinda Gates Foundation, is the first step on extending this paradigm shift to other areas required for maintaining and advancing modern civilization.

The original source of this article is [Land Destroyer](#)
Copyright © [Tony Cartalucci](#), [Land Destroyer](#), 2012

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Tony Cartalucci](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca