
Corporate predators

Robert Cohen. Tamara : Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science. Las Cruces: 2001. Vol. 1, Iss. 2; pg. 25, 9 pgs

Abstract (Article Summary)

The dairy industry has corrupted America's political system and has become the successful model for a new American government in which corporate donations buy political favors. It all began with Pres Richard Nixon.

Full Text (5126 words)

Copyright TamaraLand Publishers 2001

[Headnote]

An invited essay from the leader of Not Milk

The dairy industry has corrupted America's political system and has become the successful model for a new American government in which corporate donations buy political favors. It all began with Richard Nixon, and carried over to George Bush Senior, and now that baton has been passed to George Bush, Junior. Along the way, Monsanto learned the money-for-favors game from the national fluid milk producers and has refined it to a new level of corporate giving and receiving. The genetically engineered bovine growth hormone was the first of biotechnology's new "Frankenfoods" and America's FDA, USDA, and the new Bush Cabinet are filled with men and women who carry a burden of possessing enormous conflicts of interest.

TRICKY DICK'S QUICK MILK FIX

On November 11, 1973, Richard Nixon's most memorable line was delivered during an hourlong televised question-and-answer session with 400 Associated Press reporters.

"The people have got to know if their President is a crook. Well, I am not a crook." Towards the end of the interview, a question was asked about whether his administration raised milk support prices in exchange for campaign contributions from the milk lobby. Denying the charge, Nixon said that Democrats led the fight in the House and Senate for higher milk prices.

While writing MILK-The Deadly Poison, I discovered transcripts of Nixon's actual meeting with dairymen on March 23, 1971. Knowing the tapes were running, and having been presented with \$3 million dollars in cash, Nixon was recorded saying:

"Uh, I know.. that, uh, you are a group that are politically very conscious.. And you're willing to do something about it. And, I must say a lot of businessmen and others...don't do anything about it. And you do, and I appreciate that. And I don't have to spell it out."

After the dairymen had left, advisor John Connally was alone with Nixon, and said:

"They are tough political operatives. This is a cold political deal."

THE EVIDENCE OF A CRIMINAL ACT

Hoard's Dairyman, is the dairy farmer's magazine, subscribed to by 108,000 people who make their living by producing and marketing milk and dairy products. The April 10, 1971 issue went to press at about the same time Nixon was meeting with dairy industry executives. At that time, Clifford Hardin was serving as the Secretary of Agriculture. Hoard's reported that milk prices would not be raised during 1971 because there was an increase in milk production, and the government found no logical support for a price hike. Here is what Hoard's wrote:

"Price supports will continue at \$4.66 in marketing year starting April 1. Secretary Hardin cited increased milk production as reason for not boosting support level"

The following issue of Hoards, published on April 25th, 1971, contained this report:

"The dairy support increase still has everybody talking here. Veteran observers can't believe yet that President Nixon moved so quickly. There's a new respect for the four large dairy cooperatives that persuaded the President the 27-cent increase was justified."

HOARD'S EDITORIAL

Within that issue, Hoard's places an indelible timeline upon the delivery of \$3 million in cash and Nixon's shocking change of mind. The "gift" was delivered on a Tuesday afternoon, March 23, 1971. On the morning of March 25th, Nixon announced at his Cabinet session that a 27 cent increase would take effect seven days later. Hoard's wrote:

"There was great surprise in the nation's Capitol and joy among dairy farmers. A change in position of this magnitude has not been noted in many decades."

Hoard's knew nothing about the bribe. They reported:

"There is little doubt in anyone's mind that full credit for persuading the President is due almost entirely to the work and support of the four cooperatives named on page 471."

A detailed article on page 471 revealed the identities of the four dairy groups: Associated Milk Producers, Inc., Mid-America Dairyman, Inc., Dairyman Inc., and Pure Milk Products Cooperative. Hoard's wrote:

"Dairyman in attendance at the meeting told Hoard's Dairyman they were impressed with the President's deep interest in their case and the penetrating questions he asked."

What seems to have been penetrated was the integrity of the American people. What did this \$3 million dollar "investment" do for the dairy industry? In 1971, 120 billion pounds of milk were produced. An additional 27 cents per hundred pounds of milk translated to \$324 million extra dollars for the dairy industry. On March 23, 1971, Secretary of the Treasury John Connally summarized the day's events to Nixon:

"These dairyman are organized; they're adamant, they're militant...And they, they're massing an enormous amount of money that they're going to put into political activities, very frankly."

In November of 1993 the White House issued a report calling Monsanto's application for

approval of their genetically engineered bovine growth hormone the greatest controversy in FDA history. A few years earlier, Bill Clinton had posed for a milk mustache ad, despite the fact that he is allergic to milk. The dairy industry had been a big financial supporter of the Democratic Party. In the Executive Branch report, twelve conclusions were made. If those conclusions were not so tragic, they would have represented government comedy at its best.

POINT #1 "BST-TREATED MILK IS SAFE BECAUSE IT IS INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM NORMAL MILK." We know that BST-treated milk and untreated milk are different. Levels of IGF-I always increase in BST-treated milk. That must logically change the conclusion of Point #1. If we assume that BST milk is safe because it is indistinguishable from non-BST milk, then the converse must be true. BST-milk is unsafe and it IS different from non-BST milk.

POINT #2 "INCOME FOR INDIVIDUAL FARMERS WHO USE BST IS LIKELY TO INCREASE BECAUSE BST FAVORS GOOD HERD MANAGEMENT." There were 140,000 dairy farms in America in 1994 when this report was issued. At the beginning of 1997, there were just 100,000 dairy farms. By January 1, 1999 there were just 92,000 dairy farms in America. Many farmers went out of business due to horrible effects from this hormone. FDA denied that there were adverse effects on cows while actually receiving formal complaints from 500 farmers during the first 12 months following its approval.

POINT #3 "BST WILL LEAD TO LOWER MILK PRICES" In 1998, the price of butter exceeded \$4.50 per pound in many markets. Milk production increased, inventory increased, and the price of dairy products soared. This was no typical supply and demand economic theory. Farmers who survived deleterious effects of BST were delirious with joy in 1998, achieving the most profitable year in their history from artificially inflated prices.

POINT #4 "LOWER MILK PRICES WOULD RESULT IN DECREASED FEDERAL COSTS FOR FOOD STAMPS AND OTHER SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAMS." I do not know who wrote this report, but, as it comes from the White House, I must assume President Clinton had to be aware of it. Obviously, the buck did not stop on his desk. In other words, public welfare costs will decrease because we allow Monsanto the right to distribute a genetically engineered hormone that causes cancer to laboratory animals and makes the milk different? You're pulling my leg, aren't you? Milk prices have increased since BST approval. This has added costs to all of the above programs. Guess who continues to pay the price?

POINT #5 "FEDERAL DAIRY PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM WOULD INCREASE BY APPROXIMATELY \$150 MILLION PER YEAR AND DECLINE IN LATER YEARS." The first part contradicts points #2, #3, and #4. The second part suggests costs will decline in later years. We've heard things like this before from politicians promising tax hikes for next year and then adding, "Don't worry, taxes will decrease in later years."

POINT #6 "SAVINGS IN THE COSTS OF FEDERAL FEEDING PROGRAMS WILL COMPLETELY OFFSET THE CUMULATIVE COSTS OF THE FEDERAL DAIRY PRICE--SUPPORT SYSTEM OVER 10 YEARS" Federal feeding program? You mean to tell me that the government also feed farmer's cows? The government subsidizes the milk, buys the surplus, gives tax breaks to companies doing research designing chemicals to poison us, and feeds their animals. What's the point? Why not just pay the dairy farmers to come to Washington, D.C., and sit at a desk like the rest of the bureaucrats and do nothing? It would probably save Americans money, and we'd be a heck of a lot healthier.

POINT #7 "CONSUMERS WILL BENEFIT OVER THE NEXT SIX YEARS WITH BST USE BECAUSE OF LOWER PRICES!" If you believe that one, I've got a bridge to sell to you. I request that each American consumer give me just one penny saved from a quart of milk. That would add up to 270 000 000 people times one cent = \$2 700 000. Turn over the money and I'll sell you the

Brooklyn Bridge.

POINT #8 "NO SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION OF DEMAND IS EXPECTED TO RESULT FROM BST USE. SOME CONSUMER SURVEYS REVEAL RESISTANCE TO BST MILK" The milk controversy resulted in decreased liquid milk consumption, despite more milk moustache ads. However, butter, ice cream and cheese consumption rates soared, as did obesity rates. In 1998, 1.5 billion less pounds of milk were consumed by Americans than in 1997. If every American realizes that the "new milk" contains increased levels of hormones, will milk consumption increase or decrease?

Point number nine is worthy of nomination for a very special classification by itself. The category is "The Environment." This conclusion is a transparent attempt to seduce and brainwash the public.

POINT #9 "BST IS EXPECTED TO HAVE A MINOR, BUT BENEFICIAL NET IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT. IT SHOULD LEAD TO A SLIGHTLY SMALLER U.S. DAIRY HERD, AND THEREFORE LESS POLLUTION THROUGH DECREASED USE OF FERTILIZERS FOR FEED PRODUCTION, AND LESS COW MANURE AND METHANE PRODUCTION." This kind of manure is appropriate for something coming out of the Executive Office.

There was a lack of sound reasoning applied by our government scientists when they assumed that fewer cows would result in less flatulence. I wonder, just how many federal dollars did the White House spend to come up with the data for this brilliant deduction? Consider that BST-treated cows will eat more food to produce 20 percent more milk. If they do not eat more food, then they will have to dissolve their own bones and burn up their own muscle and fat to produce that 20 percent more milk product. So, if they eat more food, then they're going to pass more gas. Perhaps we can get the author of this study a job writing for Saturday Night Live, Leno or Letterman.

POINT #10 "BST SHOULD HAVE LITTLE, IF ANY, EFFECT ON U.S. DAIRY EXPORTS. NEARLY HALF OF U.S. DAIRY EXPORTS GO TO COUNTRIES THAT HAVE APPROVED THE USE OF BST, AND MORE COUNTRIES ARE EXPECTED TO DO SO." The Canadian Health Ministry recently turned down Monsanto's application for the genetically engineered hormone. They no longer accept American dairy products. The European Community also placed a moratorium on the use of BST in their markets until the year 2002. This ban occurred sometime after the publication of this Executive Report. This not only invalidates point #10, but helps to invalidate points #1 through #9 as well. Both bans were done for safety reasons.

POINT #11 "U.S. LEADERSHIP IN BIOTECHNOLOGY, AS WELL AS PRIVATE-SECTOR INVESTMENT FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE BIOTECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY, WOULD BE ENHANCED BY PROCEEDING WITH BST, AND WOULD BE IMPEDED IF THERE WERE NEW GOVERNMENT OBSTACLES TO SUCH BIO-TECH PRODUCTS FOLLOWING THEIR APPROVAL FOR USE BY FDA AND OTHER REGULATORY AGENCIES."

This was always much more than just a milk issue. It was all about genetic engineering of our entire food supply. Milk was just the model. When cancer popped its ugly name into the equation, every favor, both political and legal, was called in by Monsanto. The White House became a key player in this enormous fraud. The health and safety of every American has been placed in jeopardy.

In other words, if we had determined that BST was not safe, we would have hurt the prospects of the new genetic engineering technology. That technology has not yet been perfected. In Steven Spielberg's movie *Jurassic Park* we became witnesses to a scenario where errors in genetic

engineering caused horrible consequences. When just one amino acid in a hormone or protein differs from the normal genetic code, there can be dire consequences. Sickle cell anemia is just one example. Another example occurs in Alzheimer's disease. The substitution of just one amino acid, phenylalanine, appears to be the basis for one type of hereditary Alzheimer's disease. With BST, improper research developed a product with a resulting gene transcription error. That error surfaced long after all of the research on BST had been performed and submitted to FDA. (Amino acid number 144 should have been lysine; it was manufactured as epsilon-N-acetyllysine, a bacterium amino acid). The "buck stopped" on Clinton's desk for one last opportunity to reveal an ugly truth. The White House report became the final obstacle, and simultaneous to its release came BST approval. When laboratory animals became sick, the incriminating data were hidden. When data proved laboratory animals got cancer from BST, the government, in its great display of bureaucratic strength, did not allow such data to be released. "BST-treated milk is indistinguishable from normal milk" Approval was based on this assumption. On page 22 of the 64-page Executive Report, the White House wrote: "There are slight variations in milk fat and milk-protein content immediately after BST treatment "The meat from BST-treated cows tends to have a lower fat content." "A slight shift in the Kjeldahl nitrogen fractions (casein, whey protein, and non-protein nitrogen) has been observed These were unconsidered clues in a puzzle not yet solved. Combined with the irrefutable fact that levels of IGF in milk increase after cows are treated with BST, this becomes one more White House fabrication in a long series of lies that have become acceptable to most Americans. The two milks were not indistinguishable. This becomes more than an impeachable crime. Cancer in laboratory animals from an additive now in our food supply portends a new millennium filled with unnecessary suffering.

I began to rigorously examine that controversy in 1994, and I learned a secret after reviewing Monsanto's own research. Laboratory animals got cancer from the new additive that is now in our milk, cheese, and ice cream. I've invested seven years of my life learning that FDA knew the truth but they hid it. Monsanto knew the truth but they also did everything in their power to pull a veil over FDA's regulatory review process for Posilac, the trade name for the genetically engineered version of a cow's natural growth hormone. That genetically engineered hormone is commonly referred to as either BST or BGH (bovine somatotropin or bovine growth hormone). The study in question was performed in 1989 by three scientists, Richard, Odaglia and Deslex. I obtained portions of that study and learned that FDA never reviewed it, despite the fact that it was the KEY to the entire controversy. On August 24, 1990, FDA published a review of the BST research. That study was authored by Judy Juskevich and Greg Guyer and published in Science magazine. I have written about that study and Chapter Three of my book, MILK-The Deadly Poison, includes the complete study with my comments. That entire chapter can be accessed on the Internet:

(<http://www.notmilk.com/deb/chapt3.html>).

After learning that laboratory animals got cancer from this hormone, I filed a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for the raw data. I wished to review the weights of spleens and kidneys and ovaries and thirty-one different tissues and organs from the 360 animals in this study. I lost that request to have the study released. I then filed a suit in Federal Court. During my suit, our government passed a law which would have had me imprisoned had I released the study

On October 3, 1994, I filed a FOIA request for the rat study data. On December 24, 1994, the FOIA request was denied by FDA. That same day I filed an appeal with Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). On April 4, 1995, that appeal was denied. On December 5, 1995, I filed a suit in Federal Court. On April 12, 1996, Monsanto joined that suit, represented by the firm of King & Spalding. On July 29, 1996, my final brief was filed with the court, arguing that the concept of trade protection be ruled invalid. The judge's decision was due on September 9, 1996.

On October 11, 1996, President William Clinton signed PUBLIC LAW # 104-294. That law was called the Economic Espionage Act. That new statute was delivered in the middle of my trial and

sent a clear message to me. If I revealed a trade secret I would have been subject to a \$10 million dollar fine and 15 years incarceration in a federal prison.

On December 6, 1996, the judge ruled in favor of Monsanto. In his denial, the Honorable Judge Wells wrote to me:

"Disclosure of the rat's study raw data would allow competitors to develop or refine their products... and would reveal a TRADE SECRET... defendants have adequately demonstrated the likelihood of competitive substantial harm if the study is released."

CONSPIRACY? TO BE OR NOT TO BE?

When Monsanto first started doing research on rbST/rbGH (Posilac), they realized its potential to change all of the foods in our supermarket. They would one day control the seeds for all of our fruits and veggies through genetic engineering and biotechnology. They needed a friend on the Supreme Court. It was then that they began to groom their attorney from the firm of King & Spalding (the same firm that represented Monsanto in my trial), a young African American with a future. Should these issues ever reach the Supreme Court, Monsanto will have a friend in Clarence Thomas.

Congress passed a law in 1958 called the Delaney Amendment to the Food and Drug Act which said that if a food additive caused cancer it was not to be approved. When Monsanto realized that their genetically engineered bovine growth hormone caused cancer in cows and laboratory animals, they had their new attorney (from King & Spalding), Michael Taylor, write a paper: "A Deminimus Interpretation of the Delaney Amendment". Lawyers usually get published in law review journals. This paper was published in the Journal of the American College of Toxicology.

Michael Taylor, Esq., left his high paying job at King & Spalding and was hired by the FDA. He became the second most powerful man at FDA and wrote the food labeling laws that governed rbST and all genetically engineered products to come.

At the same time that Taylor left Monsanto for FDA, the scientists left Monsanto too. Monsanto's top dairy scientist, Margaret Miller, left the pharmaceutical giant and went to work for FDA. Her job was to review her own research. I filed a Freedom of Information Act request for her actual job application and found out that she developed a test for detecting rbST, even though FDA later relieved Monsanto of that responsibility.

Congress formed a committee to study the labeling issues. There were four members of the Dairy, Livestock and Poultry Committee. These men considered a bill that would have required that dairy products containing rbST be labeled as such. These 12 men stalled the bill for six months and never voted upon it. The bill did not make it to the floor of Congress for a vote. When the 1994 session of Congress expired, the bill expired. I investigated these men and learned that they accepted donations (PAC money) from companies with agriculture interests totaling \$711,000. Four of the Congressmen accepted money directly from Monsanto while they stalled that bill. They included Volkmer (\$2,000), Dooley (\$1,000), Gunderson (\$1,000) and Pombo (\$500).

Somebody had to have gotten Monsanto's scientist and attorney hired by FDA. I interviewed ex-FDA commissioners and ex-bosses of these employees and all deny doing the actual hiring. I can only imagine a phone call, calling in a favor here and there. I have no proof who did the hiring, only proof that the deck was stacked in the review process. I include enormous documentation in MILK-- The Deadly Poison.

Monsanto hired the very respected C. Everett Koop, M.D., to attack critics of rbST. Koop said the BST treated milk was indistinguishable from wholesome untreated milk. This was not true. Levels of another powerful growth hormone always increase in bst-treated milk. That hormone is called insulin-like growth factor (IGF-I). IGF-I is identical between humans and cows. IGF-I has been called the key factor in the growth and proliferation of breast and prostate cancer.

Monsanto hired the outgoing FDA commissioner, Arthur Hull Hayes. He went to work for their public relations firm. There was a revolving door policy at FDA. In addition, Michael Taylor left FDA and became an Undersecretary at USDA after Agriculture Secretary Michael Espy resigned. Taylor was there to see that genetic engineering reached its potential without regulatory interference. Taylor became the author of the regulations.

Margaret Miller, Monsanto's scientist-turned-- FDA regulator, was aware that cows were getting mastitis in clinical trials. She arbitrarily changed the antibiotic protocol and increased the amounts of permissible antibiotic residues in milk. Before she got to FDA, the standard allowed one part per hundred million. After Miller's change, it was increased by 100 times to one part per million. Consumers Union tested milk in the New York metropolitan area and found the presence of 52 different antibiotics in milk samples. The Wall Street Journal did their own tests and confirmed Consumers results.

When Bob Dole ran for president his Chief of Staff was Donald Rumsfeld, ex-president of SEARLE, a company acquired by Monsanto. To place things in perspective... the 1989 smoking gun study was performed by Searle scientists for MONSANTO. For all practical purposes, those firms were and are one and the same.

When William Clinton praised Monsanto in his 1996 State-of-the-Union address, how many Americans noticed? I sure did. Michael Taylor, the Monsanto attorney turned FDA and USDA employee, is a first cousin to Al Gore's wife, Tipper.

In order to prove rbST safe Monsanto did a study in Guelph, Canada that led to approval. FDA cited the study in their Science paper but incorrectly cited the reference. They gave credit to Jerome Moore. When I pulled Moore's paper there was no mention of this reference. I pulled dozens of other papers and found the smoking gun. Had I written a paper like this for high school biology I would have failed. Here was a paper in the most important journal in the world on the most controversial study in FDA history and they made this mistake (and many other errors documented in Chapter 3 of my book). Here is what happened:

The Canadian scientist (still an undergrad working with three Monsanto scientists) pasteurized milk at the normal temperature and time to prove that it destroyed the BST. It did not. He then pasteurized milk for thirty minutes at 72 degrees Celsius (162 degrees Fahrenheit), a temperature reserved for 15 seconds. That only destroyed nineteen percent of the BST. When that did not work, he sprinkled powdered BST into the milk and pasteurized that. This time, the experiment worked. They destroyed 90 percent of the "spiked milk." That was their word, "spiked." FDA concluded that milk was safe to drink because pasteurization destroyed the BST. When FDA wrote the Science paper they included 75 references. Number 75 was credited to Suzanne Sechen, another Monsanto scientist who was hired by FDA to review her own research. Number one reference is usually reserved as an honorary place for a key scientist. Reference number one was given to Dale Bauman, Ph. D., who is a Cornell researcher and professor. Dale Bauman's papers continue to repeat the myth that pasteurization destroyed the BST. Bauman refuses to debate me but he continues to teach this fraud to his students. As a result of this lie, FDA did three things. First, Monsanto was relieved of doing any further toxicology studies. Second, Monsanto was relieved of the responsibility of developing a test to detect the presence of BST in milk. Last but not least a "zero day withdrawal" was determined. Zero Day Withdrawal is an FDA

designation meaning that a substance is perfectly safe for human consumption.

On March 10, 2000, I became one of 27 individuals to testify before USDA's Dietary Guidelines Committee. This committee decides what foods make up USDA's famous food pyramid.

Under-secretary Eileen Kennedy had instructed each speaker to state his or her name, organization, and source of funding-I had three minutes to speak, and had no prepared statement. Here is the transcript of my statement:

MR. COHEN: Thank you. I'm Robert Cohen. I'm with the Dairy Education Board. We have a shoestring budget, and I pay for the shoestrings. I'd like to ask you, since this is the first time I've ever been asked who funds me, who funds you, Dr. Kennedy? Who funds you, Dr. Watkins and Lurie and Huberto Garza who's listening on the telephone? Dr. Kennedy, you said that this is an open and transparent process. Americans know how transparent it is. Ms. Lurie, you said there's a history of collaboration. Dr. Watkins, you travel America speaking to trade organizations. It's on the Internet. Native Americans, you go to South Dakota and North Dakota to Indian Reservations and tell them how they need more milk and cheese and you're going to give it to them. This is a transparent process. We know, Dr. Kennedy, that you're on the Board of Directors of a research organization funded by Dannon Yogurt. We know Huberto Garza, that you get \$500,000 a year from USDA as a line item. At Cornell University you work for the Dairy Council. And Joanna Dwyer who worked on this food dietary guideline committee worked for the dairy industry as did Rachel Johnson and Roland Weinsten and Richard Deckelbaum and it goes on and on, Scott Grundy. All connections to the dairy industry. What's going on here? The first part, I want to tell you that we're not pleased about these conflicts of interest. I sat with the Vice President of the United States yesterday and with Senator Barbara Boxer, and we're all not pleased about these conflicts of interest. Can't you come up with a committee that doesn't have these conflicts?

The Presidential election of 2000 made American history, and one vote on the Supreme Court decided that election. Will America take note that the real swing voter returned an enormous favor to Monsanto and other biotechnology firms? That respected juror, Clarence Thomas, once worked for Monsanto. Appointed to the Supreme Court by George Bush, Sr., his vote decided the election. A vote for George Bush, Jr. was a vote for Monsanto and biotechnology. The new George Bush Cabinet exists as evidence of favors paid back to those who really run America.

THE PELICAN BRIEF

John Grisham wrote the best selling novel. Julia Roberts and Denzel Washington starred in the blockbuster movie. Two Supreme Court justices are assassinated so that an evil oil billionaire can petition the president to appoint environmentally unfriendly justices to America's highest court. It's all about politics, multi-national firms, and dollars.

In 1994, Monsanto Agricultural Company gained approval for their genetically engineered bovine growth hormone. That hormone became the most controversial drug application in the history of America's Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Monsanto's hormone caused cancer in laboratory animals, and was banned in Europe and Canada. Monsanto's genetically engineered crops continue to make headline news throughout the world, and their patented seeds have become the seeds of controversy. In the 2000 election, Monsanto donated hundreds of thousands of dollars in PAC money and soft money to political candidates. The man receiving the second highest total dollars from Monsanto was Larry Combest (R-TX). He got \$2000. Combest is the powerful chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. Who got the most from Monsanto? The winner of the Monsanto sweepstakes with \$10,000 was John Ashcroft (R-MO). Ashcroft will be George Bush's Attorney General.

Follow the Monsanto connection to George Bush's presidency. This brief will be more convincing than Grisham's Pelican Brief. Monsanto's lawyer was appointed to the Supreme Court by George Bush, Sr. The deciding swing voter gave the election to George, Jr. That justice: Clarence Thomas, Esq.

Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense, was president of Searle Pharmaceuticals, purchased by Monsanto. Ann Veneman, Secretary of Agriculture, was on the board of directors of Calgene Pharmaceuticals, purchased by Monsanto. Tommy Thompson, Secretary of Health, was a supporter of Monsanto in Wisconsin. He received \$50,000 from biotech firms in his election run, and used state funds to set up a \$317 million biotech zone in Wisconsin. Mitch Daniels, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, was the vice president of corporate strategy at Eli Lilly Pharmaceutical Company. Eli Lilly and Monsanto developed the genetically engineered bovine growth hormone. Lilly "owns" the European "franchise." Daniels' presence insures that the bovine growth hormone will one day be approved for use in Europe.

The House of Representatives Agriculture Committee Chairman, Larry Combest (R-TX), named Richard Pombo to head Agriculture's dairy, livestock, and poultry sub-committee. Pombo will have enormous power in chairing this committee. In 1994, the Dairy Committee considered a bill that would label milk and milk products containing the genetically engineered hormone. The Dairy Committee stalled the proposed bill until the 1994 elections. When the 1994 session of Congress expired, the bill died. It was never even voted upon. A subsequent investigation of Pombo revealed that he accepted money directly from Monsanto while voting on a bill that impacted Monsanto's future and the future of biotechnology.

Last, but not least. John Ashcroft, Attorney General. The one man out of 535 members of the House of Representatives and the Senate receiving the greatest amount of financial support from Monsanto. He received five times the amount of money as the congressman finishing second. Where do Americans finish in this stranger than fiction real life drama? Last.

People often ask me if I have any concern over a dairy industry lawsuit. I usually laugh at that suggestion. I have zero concern. I don't imagine that they would be that stupid. As a matter of fact, I would welcome such litigation. Imagine Court TV's coverage of "Dairy on Trial?" The immortal words of NBA ballplayer, Charles Barkley, best sum up the likelihood of the dairy industry filing a potential suit against me:

"My initial response was to sue her for defamation of character, but then I realized that I had no character."

Sue me? As Clint Eastwood's "Dirty Harry" would say, "Go ahead, make my day."

[Author Affiliation]

Robert Cohen

<http://www.notmilk.com>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction or distribution is prohibited without permission.

Subjects:

People: Nixon, Richard M

Author(s): Robert Cohen
Article types: Feature
Publication title: Tamara : Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science. Las Cruces: 2001. Vol. 1, Iss. 2; pg. 25, 9 pgs
Source Type: Periodical
ISSN/ISBN: 15325555
Text Word Count 5126