

Why Anyone Who Questions the Safety of GMOs is Labeled Anti-Science

And why everyone should question GMOs

By [Christina Sarich](#)

Theme: [Biotechnology and GMO](#)

Global Research, November 16, 2015

[Natural Society](#) 13 November 2015

How do you continue to push GM crops on a population that has overwhelmingly voted against them in poll after poll? You start a campaign similar to the one the tobacco industry began in the 1920's with the help of Edward Bernays to discredit any naysayers and even put doctors in commercials smoking cigarettes. You also do whatever it takes to buy out 'real' scientists and call those into question who inquire about the true safety of GM foods. You label them anti-science and discredit their credentials.

As GMWatch.org [states](#):

“First, there has been a tendency to label anyone who dislikes GMOs as anti-science — and put them in the anti-antibiotics, anti-vaccine, even Luddite category. There is, of course, nothing scientific about the comparison. Nor is the scholastic invocation of a “consensus” a valid scientific argument.

Interestingly, there are similarities between arguments that are pro-GMO and snake oil, the latter having relied on a cosmetic definition of science. The charge of “therapeutic nihilism” was leveled at people who contested snake oil medicine at the turn of the 20th century. (At that time, anything with the appearance of sophistication was considered “progress”.)”

Just like with tobacco, the government agencies which are meant to police our food and water supply have been infiltrated with biotech interests. Bernays, and propaganda theorist Walter Lippman were members of the U.S. Government's Committee on Public Information (CPI) that helped to promote cigarettes, especially to women, through a war-like propaganda campaign. This is so similar to what Monsanto, Dow, Bayer, Syngenta, Cargill, etc. do now. It seems biotech has looked at the Marlboro Man playbook for tips. [1]

So who [does the PR](#)?

- Hugh Grant, the CEO
- Janet M Holloway, Sr. VP, Chief of Staff of Community Relations
- Kerry J Preete, Sr. VP of Global Strategy
- And others

Grant recently [said the following](#) to CNBC:

“Twenty years since the first crops were planted in '96, the intensity and use of chemistry has actually declined during that time so growers now are applying less. The next turn in this, the next breakthrough is how you apply less than an acre, how you apply it much more precisely. And I think the Monsanto Syngenta combination completely redefines the industry one more time in how we use chemistry and link it much more intimately to seed.”

Too bad that merger failed, and farmers are having to resort to more toxic versions of herbicides to try to get their jobs done. Monsanto is spending another [\\$1 billion on a new dicamba herbicide](#) after [the WHO declared](#) the best-selling product, Roundup, was probably carcinogenic.

Alas, are we to be lemmings, led off the edge of the cliff, and forced to jump off while Monsanto, just like in old cigarette ads, assures us all these chemicals and GMOs are safe?

Forgive me, but it doesn't take a scientist to figure out this insanity. I can be called anti-science all day long, but at this point it boils down to some simple common sense.

Notes:

[1] [TheSocietyPages](#)

The original source of this article is [Natural Society](#)
Copyright © [Christina Sarich](#), [Natural Society](#), 2015

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Christina Sarich](#)

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