

# How to play into Monsanto's hands: label GMOs

by

**Jon Rappoport**

on

[Jon Rappoport](#)



People are easy to manipulate. When presented with a problem and the apparent solution, they will choose the solution because it's in front of their faces.

Worse yet, if the solution has a little momentum, if it is backed by a bit of cash, if "the good people" favor it, it will seem like the only choice.

"This is what we have. We have to support it. We can't turn back."

Spoken like a true believer, and a true loser.

People look for the easy way out. They look for an answer that involves the least amount of unpleasant conflict.

"See? Just vote for GMO labeling. If we win, that's it. No muss, no fuss. Cast your ballot. Brilliant."

Or how about this: "Look. Monsanto is pouring millions into defeating GMO labeling. That shows how scared they are. We're on the right track."

Wrong.

Of course Monsanto would like to defeat labeling, but at a deeper level they're sucking the opposition into the game they, Monsanto, want. Monsanto can deal with GMO labeling. They can spend millions more convincing the consumer that GMO food is good food, if labeling comes to pass.

For Monsanto, labeling is the lesser of evils. The real dangers for them are 1) a ban on growing GMO crops, and 2) a million people on the streets and on college campuses revolting against the worst corporation in the world.

For Monsanto, labeling is a limited hangout. It's, "Well, maybe labeling is a good thing if all you people want it. Sure, why not? We'll support you, if you insist. But we still maintain there is nothing wrong with genetically modified food."

Labeling is, in fact, very good for Monsanto if it keeps people distracted from the dangers I just mentioned. It's a cover. It's a dead-end, because while states try to pass labeling initiatives, the gene drift is sending Monsanto GMOs into plants from California to Maine. Fait accompli. The land of the nation is blanketed with GMOs.

Labeling is a misdirection. It sucks up people, time, money, and energy into the "officially certified" response to Monsanto.

It takes the weakness of the anti-GMO movement and uses it. That weakness is superficiality, the desire for the easy answer, the nice answer, the answer that requires no outrage, the consumerist answer:

"People have a right to know what's in their food."

When has there ever been a true revolution based on the consumer?

The thought of it is absurd.

When the labeling initiative in California, Prop 37, went down to defeat, I predicted that the next state campaign up for grabs, in Washington, would follow the same disastrous game plan:

"Tell people they have a right to know what's in their food, and tell them nothing else."

No, no, I was assured—Washington will be different. Voters will be shown all the horrors of GMOs. They'll know why they need labeling.

That was just a pipe dream.

Washington is a replica of California.

I firmly believe the labeling movement has been infiltrated at the highest levels. The businessmen who are funding the initiatives have given in to their own weakness and shortsighted view of what moves people, and they have been steered by advisors and PR experts, who are the infiltrators:

"You need a one-idea slogan. Just one idea. Keep it simple. Keep it nice. You're speaking to consumers. Just tell them they have a right to know what kind of food they're buying. That's your only chance of winning."

The businessmen understand that kind of talk. They run companies. They devise ways of expanding their customer base.



When it comes to what works politically, they're morons.

And they have no stomach for a real battle.

But they gain allies, because it appears (falsely) that these ballot initiatives are the only game in town.

Monsanto wants it that way.

Monsanto wants a landscape in which voting for ballot measures seems to be the only choice anti-GMO people can make.

Monsanto wants a landscape in which it appears these labeling initiatives rose up spontaneously out of the earth by popular acclaim.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

A small group of men with money made that decision in concert. They knew their money would talk. And it did.

These men are content to coexist with Monsanto. They have already surrendered.

On January 27, 2011, Ronnie Cummins, the head of the Organic Consumer's Association, quoted a Whole Foods email:

"The policy set for GE [GMO] alfalfa will most likely guide policies for other GE crops as well. True coexistence is a must." – Whole Foods Market, Jan. 21, 2011

Cummins then wrote:

"In the wake of a 12-year battle to keep Monsanto's Genetically Engineered (GE) crops from contaminating the nation's 25,000 organic farms and ranches, America's organic consumers and producers are facing betrayal. A self-appointed cabal of the Organic Elite, spearheaded by Whole Foods Market, Organic Valley, and Stonyfield Farms, has decided it's time to surrender to Monsanto. Top executives from these companies have publicly admitted that they no longer oppose the mass commercialization of GE crops, such as Monsanto's controversial Roundup Ready alfalfa, and are prepared to sit down and cut a deal for 'coexistence' with Monsanto and USDA biotech cheerleader Tom Vilsack."

Who are the major funders of the labeling ballot measures? The CEOs of Stonyfield, Lundberg, Whole Foods, and Dr. Bronner's.

Joe Mercola, too. I would like to hear him talk about his original decision to fund these ballot initiatives, what his thinking was, and how deeply he explored the concept of political action—what works and what doesn't—back there at the beginning, when the die was cast on how Americans would oppose Monsanto.

In case anybody cares to think about it, we are not, first and foremost, consumers.

What moves people to great action is not shopping.

How are real political movements born?

Did the men who gathered to write and sign the Declaration of Independence say, "You have a right to know?"

YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO KNOW?



That's the slogan of these ballot measures.

"We're not saying GMOs are good or bad. That's not up to us. We're gutless. But wouldn't you agree you have a right to know whether you're eating them?"

Speaking dumb because you believe people are dumb is a failed operation.

It can work during, say, a Presidential election, when the electorate is already hypnotized into believing they must choose between two criminal poseurs.

But in launching and sustaining a long-term political and social goal, it's a loser from the get-go.

It doesn't galvanize people. It doesn't inspire people.

It might stir the folks who shop at Whole Foods, but I can tell you America isn't going to change its mind about Monsanto based on "moms" who walk into those stores with yoga mats rolled up under their arms, trying to stave off emotional and spiritual collapse because their bodies are starting to blimp out.

"Yes, Mr. Franklin. I'll sign the Declaration. My waistline is developing a ripple."