

“I Love GMO”: The Warped World Of The Pro-GMO Lobbyist

By [Colin Todhunter](#)

Global Research, July 06, 2015

Theme: [Biotechnology and GMO](#)

There's a massive [spike in cancer cases](#) in Argentina that is strongly associated with glyphosate-based herbicides. These herbicides are a huge earner for agribusiness. But don't worry, [Patrick Moore](#) says you can drink a whole quart and it won't harm you. Who needs independent testing?

Anyway, all that scare mongering about GMOs and glyphosate is a conspiracy by a bunch of whinging lavishly funded green-blob types. Former UK environment minister [Owen Paterson](#) said as much. He says those self-serving anti-GMO people are damaging the interests of the poor and are profiting handsomely. They are condemning “billions” to lives of poverty.

He voted for the illegal invasion of Iraq, which has led to the death of almost 1.5 million Iraqis. His government has [plunged millions into poverty and food insecurity](#) in the UK. He now wants to help the poor by giving them GM courtesy of self-interested, corporations and their lavishly paid executives. What was that about self-serving, lavishly funded groups? As a staunch believer in doublespeak, hypocrisy and baseless claims by self-appointed humanitarians with awful track records, Paterson's sound-bite smears and speeches are good enough for me.

So with that cleared up, hopefully we can move on.

Then there's all that 'anti-capitalist twaddle' (another pearl of wisdom from Patrick Moore) about smallholders being driven from their lands and into poverty due to a corporate takeover aimed at expanding (GM) chemical-intensive agriculture. I showed Mr Moore a paper by economics professor Michel Chossudovsky who had studied the devastation caused by the above in [Ethiopia](#). That's where the 'anti-capitalist twaddle' retort came in. As I'm also a staunch believer in the power of baseless, ill-informed abuse, I was once again convinced.

What about all that rubbish about GM not having enhanced the world's ability to feed itself? You know, all that stuff about the way it has been used has merely led to [greater food insecurity](#). Nonsense. I watched a prime-time [BBC programme](#) recently. Some scientist in a white coat in a lab said that GM can feed the world. He'd proved it in his lab. In reality (not in a lab), the fact it hasn't done anything of the sort over the past 20-odd years doesn't matter. He wore a white coat and held GM patents, so he definitely knows best!

I once read that industrialised agriculture is [less productively efficient](#) than smallholder agriculture that feeds most of the world. And then I read that the world can feed itself [without GMOs](#). According to all of this, it is [current policies](#) and the [global system of food production](#) that militate against achieving global food security.

That's just a big old load of rubbish put together by a bunch of conspiracy mongers. Who are these people? Food and trade policy analysts, political scientists, economics professors and the like. A bunch of whining anti-capitalist promoters of twaddle. None of them have studied molecular biology so how can they possibly be qualified to talk on this? I'd rather listen to a man in a lab who says GM can feed the world. He's much more qualified to speak on politics, trade, the environment or anthropology than a bunch of lefties who don't know one side of a petri dish from the other.

I happen to believe a profitable techno-fix is the way to go. A techno-fix that comes courtesy of the same companies whose [global influence and power](#) are helping to [destroy indigenous agriculture](#) across the world. But this is for the good of the traditional smallholder because these companies really, really care about the poor. Okay, okay, I know the top execs over at Monsanto are bringing in a [massive annual cheque](#) – but \$12.4 million per year helps motivate a CEO to get out of bed in the morning and to develop empathy with the poor – unlike that elitist, self-serving green blob lot who rake in big money – according to hero-of-the-poor, the handsomely rewarded [millionaire Owen Paterson](#)... err, let's swiftly move on.

To divert your attention away from all that scare mongering, conspiracy theory twaddle, I want you to concentrate solely on the science of GM and nothing else. But only on the [version of 'science'](#) as handed down from the great lawgiver in St Louis which creates it in its own image, not least by dodging any problematic questions that may have prevented GM from going on the market in the first place. Some troublemaker recently wrote a book about that, but someone said it wasn't worth reading – so I didn't bother ('[Altered Genes, Twisted...](#)' something or other – the word escapes me; it doesn't appear in my lexicon).

So how about joining like-minded humanitarians and the handsomely-paid people over at big bioworld? We believe in [mouthing platitudes](#) about freedom and choice while [serving interests](#) that [eradicate both](#). And let me add that scientists know that anyone who disagrees with them is just plain dim. C S Prakash recently posted a claim that implied such [on Twitter](#). He's a molecular biologist, so it must be true. Of course, there are scientists who disagree with us but they are quite clearly wrong – wrong methodology, wrong findings, wrong career turn – [we'll make sure of that!](#)

In finishing, let me make the case for GM clear, based on logic and clear-headed rationality. There are those who are just too dim to understand any of the issues to do with GM so they should put up, shut up or go away and read or write about conspiracy theories on their blogs or in their peer-reviewed non-science journals that aren't worth the paper they are written on given that the 'peers' in question are probably also a bunch of left-leaning wing nuts.

By comparison, unlike those self-serving ideologues, we are totally non-political. Okay, we might be firmly supporting a neoliberalism that is dominated by unaccountable big corporations which have [captured policy-making space nationally and internationally](#), but any discussion of that is to be avoided by labelling those who raise such matters as politically motivated. We get you to focus on 'the science' – that is 'our science' – and nothing else. The fact that some of us tend to label anyone who disagrees with us as anti-science, anti-capitalist, socialists or enemies of the poor (or even '[murdering bastards](#)') says nothing at all about our political agenda.

And the lavish funds and [powerful strategic position](#) of big agribusiness means the pro-GMO lobby can smear, exert [huge political influence](#) and also restrict choice by [preventing the labelling](#) of GM food. You see, too much choice confuses people. We take the public for fools

who will swallow anything – hopefully GMOs and our sound-bite deceptions.

So rests the case for GMOs. Eloquently put? I certainly think so. But I would say that, wouldn't I? I'm paid to.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Colin Todhunter](#), Global Research, 2015

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Colin Todhunter](#)

About the author:

Colin Todhunter is an extensively published independent writer and former social policy researcher. Originally from the UK, he has spent many years in India. His website is www.colintodhunter.com
https://twitter.com/colin_todhunter

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