



Episode 10
Transcript

Patrick G.: Hi, Dr. Patrick Gentempo here, CEO of Revealed Films, and host of GMOs revealed. First let me just say thank you for supporting the GMOs revealed mission. So glad you invested in this project and so glad to bring you this bonus material as a reward for doing so. We have a great bonus episode here with a series of people, and actually one group interview that you will see. These people are making a difference. The information that they're presenting is something that you should be alerted to by virtue of the fact that you stepped up and you supported this mission. The people in this bonus episode you will probably have a keen interest in, and you'll probably relate to them in some way, shape, or form.

Again, thanks from the bottom of our heart. GMOs revealed has made a difference in the world, and that's because of you. Also, I'll mention one other thing. You'll get emails from us every so often. Hey, if you got any comments or anything that you think that we should know about, please hit reply. Send it to us. I read them all. Sometimes we get a lot of them so it might take me a while, but I do read them all. I appreciate any questions, comments that you might have. Go ahead and reply to those emails we send you. Enjoy this episode. Again, thank you for supporting this vision.

Beth Bisel: My name is Beth Bisel. I'm a registered dietitian, and I have a small consulting practice. That's a long story, what made me initially want to learn about GMOs and become so passionate about it. It probably started when my oldest daughter came home from school in first grade and told me that she couldn't sit with her friend at the lunch table anymore because her friend had a peanut allergy and she had to sit at a separate table with other children who had peanut allergies. I graduated from college and became a dietitian in the mid-1980s. We never ever learned about peanut allergies or food allergies.

When she came home and said this, I just said, "Children are allergic to food? What?" It made me wonder and it made me start investigating. At the same time, I had family members that started getting fatal food allergies and also family members, extended family members that had infertility. Again, this blew my mind. In addition, I had referrals from physicians to counsel people with celiac disease. Another disease that in the 80s when I was in school, I never heard of. Or if I heard of it, it was just touched upon.

I started looking into food. First I was looking at trans fat, which we all know now, then no one had ever heard of it but we know now is really a pretty bad thing. That lead me to learning about the cash crops that are cash crops of the United States, corn, soy, canola from Canada but also grown in the United States. In learning about the cash crops, it just let me into learning that all those crops pretty much, like 90% of them came from seeds that were engineered in a lab to produce their own pesticide or tolerate being drowned in herbicides that normally were used to kill weeds on sidewalks. They were putting it on our food.

Those products are called GMOs, or genetically modified organisms or foods. They are in about 80% of all processed foods that we in America are eating, even though they're banned or required to be labeled in 62 other countries. I think the reason I got so involved in finding out more about GMOs was as I was concerned number one for my family. I was concerned for my clients. My world was rocked when I found out that everything I was teaching people was wrong, and so many of the foods I was telling people were okay were not okay anymore. They haven't been okay since 1996. It's just growing every single year.

All autoimmune diseases are on the rise. Diabetes is on the rise. Obesity is on the rise. Children are getting diagnosed with high cholesterol and being treated with drugs to lower that cholesterol and being told by people who are trying to help them but really don't know better to stop eating eggs and stop eating butter and start eating margarine. That is so old-fashioned and so not right. Margarine is trans fat. Saturated fat like butter actually helps the cell membrane to stay firm, and it helps with the cell membrane integrity. You know, there's a lot of information out there that's just not right.

The more I read about it, the more I complained to my husband. He was actually the one that said, "You really should do something about it instead of just complaining and talking about it to family and friends and your clients, do something about it." It was soon after that that I heard there was going to be a public hearing in Connecticut. This was last year. I went and testified. Really, I was representing myself as a mother and as a nutrition professional and also all the other mothers who were concerned and didn't have the background that I have to talk about it.

When I testified, listened to the testimony of lobbyists for the biotech industry, my whole body was shaking. They actually at one point, one of the lobbyists, a scientist called Bt toxin nutrition. Bt toxin is something that organic farmers actually use to spray on their crops. You can wash it off. It gets degraded by the sun. It gets blown off by the wind. It gets washed off by the rain. When they take Bt toxin which is one species, and put it into another species like corn, the corn's DNA, that Bt toxin is present in every single kernel of GMO corn.

That corn is used to make everything from infant formula through the supplements that we give our patients when they're not eating in the nursing home. We are drinking, we are eating Bt toxin every day. There was a study up in Canada that found Bt toxin in the blood of 90% of the pregnant women who were tested, and 80 some percent of their unborn babies. It doesn't get degraded by the digestive system as we've been told.

To tell a nutrition professional that something is a nutrient that's a toxin, and to know that when my babies were little, I gave them formula, I did nurse I knew how important it is to nurse your babies. I also mixed a little formula with cereal when they started eating cereal. I live with that guilt for the rest of my life and wonder, what did I do to my children by giving them genetically modified foods?

When my children are in this house, it's pretty GMO-safe. We just went on vacation. I had no control. When they go to their games or their friend's birthday parties and they get frosting this thick on their bakery made cupcakes, and I know what's in that, the GMO beet sugar, cottonseed oil that's genetically modified, lard that's genetically modified oils and partially hydrogenated fat, I have a very hard time with it because I don't want to provide deprive them. I don't want them to hate me for the rest of their lives because I never let them eat anything fun. On the other hand, I'm at a loss. How can I control it? There's no controlling it right now. It's everywhere.

If you can buy organic, buy organic. Because organic food can't legally be genetically modified. I'm sorry to say that, because I know from being an organic family that we spend three times as much on our grocery bills as people who don't buy organic. But I think that with labeling, there will be enough companies that will just stop putting the GMOs in their foods rather than put it on the

label. That's what they did in Europe. People won't always have to buy organic. They'll be able to look at a box of crackers and say, "It doesn't say it has genetically modified ingredients in it, so I guess it's safe to buy this." Even though the biotech industry and the Grocery Manufacturers Association, they're telling us that labeling will make groceries go up, I think labeling will make grocery bills come down.

I think we're starting to be listened to, but I think more mothers have to use their voices and speak out and say enough is enough. Most importantly they have to do it with what they're spending their money on. They have to stop buying processed foods. They have to make phone calls to the companies and say, "I'm not buying that product anymore until you get the GMOs out." They have to boycott companies.

If you eat real food, you automatically lose weight, for one thing. There are so many obese children in our country now. I really think that it's because of all the chemicals that are put in their bodies every single day. They're cheap, they're convenient, and the kids are getting fat from that. I think that once they learn to make their own lunches and learn how to cook and parents spend a little bit more buying real food and cooking for their families, the children will automatically lose weight, and their nutritional status will just naturally become much better.

The first thing they should do is change their oil. No more vegetable oil. Don't be afraid to use saturated fat like real organic grass fed butter. Coconut oil is a very good food. Replace vegetable oil with, like canola oil. Replace canola oil which is in every recipe because people think it's healthy with grapeseed oil or safflower oil or some other oil or an oil that's not genetically modified, which would be corn oil, soy oil, canola oil, cottonseed oil.

When my son was in fifth grade, I got this list of allowed snacks. It says in order to ensure the safety of our students, because so many of them have food allergies, only the following list of snacks will be permitted in the classroom. Yogurt. Okay, yogurt unless it's organic, may have growth hormone injected into the cows, had growth hormone. It will have sugar in it that may come from genetically modified sugar beets. Fresh or canned fruit, check, that's okay. Pretzels, genetically modified oils. cheese, cheese sticks, cottage cheese, okay unless they have growth hormone in them. So unless they're organic, I don't recommend those. Things like teddy

grahams, honey made graham crackers, goldfish crackers. Goldfish I think have four or five genetically modified and them. Everybody thinks they're healthy. Craisins or raisins.

Okay, I call raisins pesticide pellets unless they're organic. Rice or corn Chex, corn, 80% of it is genetically modified, at least. Cheese nips or Cheez-its, GMO. Smart food, also GMO. Popcorn is not genetically modified, but the stuff they cook it in and the stuff they put on it is genetically modified, or at least it was the last time I checked. Same thing with Sun Chips. Same thing with Betty Crocker fruit gushers or fruit snacks. Not to mention what those things do to your teeth. Fruit roll-ups, again, the teeth. Wheatables, toasted crackers, Tostitos corn chips, all of those are foods that I would never allow my children to eat. Here I am being told you can only send these foods. I disobeyed the rules.

My fear is that if legislation is not passed, the entire food supply is going to be taken over by the biotech industry. There are already 75 or so foods in the pipeline that they are trying to get approval to genetically modify them. That's a huge fear. Two of the major foods that are in the pipeline waiting for government approval right now are, one is genetically modified salmon where they actually inject, they put the species of a certain type of eel into a salmon so that it grows faster. They also inject growth hormone into that salmon. That's going to be one that is very close to approval. It will be the first genetically modified animal that we are eating directly.

Right now if we eat beef, it comes from cows that were fed GMO corn and soy, but the cows aren't genetically modified. With salmon, the actual fish that we eat will be genetically modified. I read somewhere that as the farmed salmon, the farmed GMO salmon escape, which they do from the farms, in 42 generations of salmon there will be no more naturally occurring salmon. It will all be frankenfish. That's one. Another one is apples. They're trying to get approval to get genetically engineered apples on the market so that if you take a bite of an apple and put it down and run to talk on the telephone, when you come back, that apple won't be brown where you bit it.

That's a really good question. Why fix something that's not broken? Salmon is high in omega-3 fatty acid. Apples are, if they're clean, if they're not loaded pesticides, they're so good for you. God made these things, why tamper with what God made? He knew what he

was doing. What I would like to say to the biotech industry and the food industry is stop messing with my children's health, with my husband's health, with my family's health. Enough is enough. Let's go back real food, conventional farming without GMOs, and taking care of the people in putting the people first, not profits.

Big agriculture is something that I have no respect for right now. I love farmers, but I love local farmers. I think it's really that we all support our local farmers in this country. Even if it takes more time to drive to the different farms and get your food that way, you look at the farmer. You can look at the farmer in the eye and ask them, is this genetically modified? Has this been sprayed with tons and tons of pesticides? How many things have you sprayed on these strawberries? Is this genetically modified corn?

Whereas big agriculture is being subsidized by our tax dollars to grow as much as they can as fast as they can with as many chemicals and genetically modified seeds as they can. I don't encourage people to support that. The way I do that is by saying, stop buying processed food. Go buy real food from real local farmers.

Speaker 3: Diana, can you tell me who you are, what your background is, and what your organization is about?

Diana: I am a citizen of Connecticut that worked hard on the labeling bill to label genetically modified foods in 2012. I was part of the team that educated legislators and educated the public in Connecticut to support the bill. The bill had widespread bipartisan support. We were very hopeful that it would pass. When the bill was eviscerated by the governor at the last minute, we were devastated at the time. I woke up the next morning and I said, "There has to be a better way." Our legislators weren't able to do their jobs because of corporate bullying.

I had signed a petition, I was one of over a million people that signed a petition to the FDA. It fell upon deaf ears. From what I understand, they put it in the trash. I to myself said there has to be a way to bring Americans together to fight collectively. To speak factors and to force them to make the change. Because we have the power to speak with our wallets.

Speaker 3: Can you tell me a little bit about what happened in that year 2012 and 2013? Because the bill did pass, correct?

Diana: The bill was passed in 2013. It does have a trigger clause, so that although it's been signed by the governor, it will not be enacted into law until an additional four states do pass similar legislation. It's a big step.

Speaker 3: It is a big step. Do you know what happened? Why did it pass the following year?

Diana: It passed because of a team that was relentless, absolutely relentless. Hats off to them for sticking with it. I did help to the extent that I could through social media, but I wasn't on the ground because I started GMO Free USA. I was heavily involved with doing a national outreach on this issue.

Speaker 3: Diana, what was it that got you wanting to educate the public regarding GMO foods and GMO labeling?

Diana: I think it started back in the mid-1990s when I read an article about the GMOs that were being introduced into our food supply and the fact that they weren't labeled and that nobody was aware of it and they were under leader at that point. I reached out to a bunch of friends of mine at the time to try and bring them up to date on what was going on with our food. Nobody seemed to be very interested. The email I sent, I remember it well. The subject line was yes, you're eating them, and no, they haven't been proven safe.

There really was very little response to that. I tucked it away and I said, "We're going to have to watch this carefully and closely." Then my family about four years ago was diagnosed with autoimmune disease. Four of us in rapid succession. It was my older daughter first, then myself, then my younger daughter, and then my husband. Once that happened I started looking for answers. I wanted to know what the common trigger was, because it seemed there had to be something. That search led me to GMOs as a potential contributor factor, and found the cause.

Speaker 3: What was the disease, if you don't mind me asking?

Diana: There are four of us with celiac disease and the three women also have Hashimoto's, autoimmune hypothyroidism.

Speaker 3: Wow. That is really impressive. Not in a good way, but it impresses that there's something really going on that you all were exposed to.

Diana: Yeah, because it was all around the same time.

Speaker 3: It's your her husband as well and it's you, and then two of the kids, and it's all at the same time. If it was genetic, you'd all get it the same age or whatever. It sounds really environmental. So what did you find out?

Diana: As I read, I learned that GMOs were potentially linked to autoimmune disease, and that they were linked to inflammation and problems with gut. That led me to reach out to other people that have potential similar health problems, and just to start the discussion and get them thinking. Then I was asked by a friend to get involved to work on a labeling bill in Connecticut, which was in 2012. I was part of the team that worked very hard to educate our legislators and to fight for that labeling bill. We had widespread bipartisan support and we were very, very positively thinking that it would pass. At the last minute, the bill died. It was eviscerated by the governor behind closed doors, so we never really knew exactly what happened. We could guess, but we didn't know for sure.

At that point I said, "You know, there has to be a better way." Because our legislators weren't able to do their job because of corporate bullying. We need to bring Americans together and educate them, because most people don't know what GMOs are, and to speak collectively to food manufacturers to make changes to our food system.

Speaker 3: That was 2012. I know 2013 was very different. Were you part of that movement or have you moved onto something else? What's your goal right now?

Diana: After I had that awakening, after the bill died I started an organization called GMO Free USA. We're a pro-science organization. We're all for science, but we like independent science. What we're doing is we're reaching out to educate the public and also to bring them together to change the food system by changing speaking collectively to food manufacturers. In that capacity, I did help what was going on Connecticut, but I helped mostly through social media. I wasn't able to get out on the street

and speak to people as I did in the previous year, because I've been kind of tied up.

Speaker 3: Can you tell me a little bit more about your organization? What's the goal long-term and short-term?

Diana: The goal is to change the food system. We would like to see some more regulatory input to the approval process of GMOs. We'd like to see independent science, and we'd like reliable long-term testing. Right now we don't have any of that. We're trying to educate the public because most people don't even know what a GMO is. I'll tell you something, when they hear that their food has been made in a lab and that it's patented by a chemical company and that it's been created using genes from foreign organisms, viruses, bacteria, and antibiotic-resistant markers, they're not real happy about that.

We need to get the word out. That's what we're trying very hard to do. People who do know, once you know what a GMO is, you don't forget. Then it comes down to freedom to choose what you eat. We're also fighting to educate people so that they fight for labeling. Because without a label, there's no traceability, there is no accountability, and there's no liability. That's the way the chemical industry likes it.

Speaker 3: What kind of things have you been up against?

Diana: There's a game they like to play with us that I like to call whack-a-mole, which is similar to the carnival game where you have that rubber mallet that you hit the moles here and they pop up there and they're all over the place. Right now the industry, meaning big food and the chemical industry, they're trying everything they can to avoid having to label GMOs. They're using many, many different tactics. We're up against, recently defeated was the Monsanto protection act, which was a writer that gave them an immunity that was stuck into a spending bill. Thank heavens that's over and done with.

Now we have the TPP, which is the transpacific partnership, which is a global trade agreement which would do much of the same. It would eliminate labeling as a barrier to trade. In Europe, they have wonderful labeling. They have standards which require anything in the EU that contains anything over .9 tenths of 1% to be labeled as containing genetically modified ingredients. This transpacific

partnership with the countries that are involved in agreement, it would eliminate labeling as a barrier to trade. It gives corporations the right to sue countries that don't allow their products into the country.

For example, if you have a country like, Tasmania is a state within Australia that's decided that they do not want GMOs. They're going to remain GMO free. They just indefinitely extended their ban on GMO plants and animals. They would be open to be sued by Monsanto for not allowing them to sell their products within that country.

Speaker 3: Oh my God.

Diana: Yeah, this is very evil stuff.

Speaker 3: This is crazy stuff. I haven't even heard of this.

Diana: It is. Yeah, that's something you probably want to learn about.

Speaker 3: Boy, it's like who wouldn't want those, they're going around bullying every, amazing. I'm shocked, obviously. I can't even get coherent words out.

Diana: That, and then there's also a major effort right now by the Grocery Manufacturers Association. They are trying to find sponsorship for a bill that would make labeling optional. It would be a voluntary labeling system. They're trying to lobby the FDA to allow GMOs to be labeled as natural. We know there's nothing natural about something that's been engineered in a lab and patented by a chemical company sprayed with herbicides and it doesn't die and made with all these foreign gene. They think that they should be allowed to label them as natural. They're also trying to water down any labeling requirements so that anything that doesn't have traceable DNA, because it's been so overprocessed, would be exempt from labeling standards. It would be allowed to be labeled on GMO.

Speaker 3: Oh my God. This is way worse than I even, I haven't heard a lot of these. I knew about the grocers, that movement.

Diana: This is a big problem because something like Kellogg's Corn Flakes which we tested, we sent to a lab for genetic testing, actually has been so overprocessed that there is no traceable DNA. They would

be allowed to label that non-GMO even if it's made from 100 Roundup ready Bt toxic corn.

Speaker 3: How can that not be traceable DNA? I don't even understand.

Diana: When it gets overprocessed.

Speaker 3: Scientists would look at it and say, I don't know what the DNA, they wouldn't identify corn at all?

Diana: It wouldn't be identifiable.

Speaker 3: Okay, that is scary. That is so unbelievably scary. Again, I'm speechless and I'm shocked. You've got a huge, you're really bucking up against a big system. What kind of support do you have?

Diana: I think our support is growing. Right now our reach is growing as well. We have people coming to us offering to help. The organization is small, but we are growing. We reached about three and a half million people last week.

Speaker 3: That's huge. That's really big. What did you put out there that reached three and a half million people?

Diana: It's primarily through social media. We share news. that's primarily what we do is we share information and news about GMOs, what's happening around the world, what's happening in our country. Right now another hot topic is the fact that Dow Chemical has filed with the USDA requesting approval for 2,4-D resistant corn and soy. That means in addition to being able to spray Roundup, the active ingredient which is glyphosate on our food, Dow is asking for permission to spray 2,4-D, which is one of the active chemical ingredients in agent orange. They want to be able to spray that on our food. We share information like that. There's a comment period which is open right now to the USDA. We encourage people to reach out to the USDA and tell them no. We don't want this.

Speaker 3: No, we don't. Do you know what their goal is? Why do they want to spray this on the food?

Diana: GMOs really are about chemical companies being able to sell more chemicals. Roundup right now is losing its effectiveness. There are 50 or 60 million acres worth of farmland in the US that have weeds that are resistant to Roundup. There are super weeds. Many of them need to be hacked with a chainsaw because they are so large

and unwieldy I guess is a good way to explain it. Dow Chemical is lobbying to use 2,4-D as an alternative. What they don't tell you is 2,4-D does not kill weeds that are resistant to Roundup.

Speaker 3: What does it do?

Diana: It's an herbicide. It will kill other weeds. The way they have the corn and soy engineered, it won't kill the crops. Anything you're trying to deal with that has developed resistance to Roundup, it won't kill it. There's been a study done which I've seen that proves it's ineffective against glyphosate tolerant weeds.

Speaker 3: Diana, can we recap? Because you've dropped so many bombs on me right now that I am going through, I'm stunned. I'm shocked and mortified, although I'm laughing because it's a nervous response because I can't believe some of the stuff you said, and I totally believe you. Can we recap some of these? Do you mind maybe just going over some of these big things? Some of the things you just told me were huge and sound like out of a science fiction story. Could you recap some of these things for me?

Diana: They do sound like they're out of a science fiction, which is part of a problem when you're trying to educate people about them. Because many times they say, "What? That's not possible. The FDA protects us, the USDA protects us." No, the truth of the matter is they don't. In terms of our whack-a-mole game, we have the TPP which is the transpacific partnership whereby corporations are being given the ability to put corporate wealth over human health.

They're being given the ability to sue countries that will not allow their products to come into the country, which includes GMOs and pharmaceuticals as well. It also is being pushed by our government. One thing that needs also to be mentioned is that President Obama is asking Congress for permission to fast-track this so that he can personally sign off on it. The text of the transpacific partnership actually has been kept secret from the American public, but was uncovered and has publicly released by WikiLeaks.

Speaker 3: Okay, that is, that's crazy.

Diana: It's insane.

Speaker 3: It's insane and scary and frightening and disappointing and sad. My God, I can't believe it. That's really like, what you're telling me, if

it's true, you're telling me that these corporations are basically asking for political permission to come and take over. You have to sell our products in your country, even if you as a government ban it or you as a government ban it in your state. We'll sue you if you don't let us sell these products in your country or in your state. To say that they're natural when they have a patent on them, and you can't patent things in their natural state, so that's doublespeak.

Diana: It is doublespeak. It really is. They want to have their cake and eat it too.

Speaker 3: It's a poisonous cake.

Diana: It's very poisonous. There was a study recently done on GMO soy, and it proves GMO soy is not substantially equivalent to non-GMO soy. They found nutritional differences. They found high levels of residue of glyphosate. It is not substantially equivalent. That is the whole basis for the FDA's approval or, what's the word I'm looking for, of GMOs. Their policy.

Speaker 3: Their policy.

Diana: That is the entire basis for their policy on GMOs, that they're substantially equivalent, and they're not. It's been scientifically proven.

Speaker 3: What can we do? If you're saying Obama is trying to fast-track this horrible legislation, what can we do? What can consumers do?

Diana: Consumers have a lot of power that needs to be brought together. We can speak with our wallets. When we speak collectively with our wallets, we are even more powerful. Another thing that my organization is doing is we are doing a nationwide boycott of all Kellogg's products. I started the boycott in July of 2012. It's growing. We are making a difference.

In the last six months, both quarterly statements from Kellogg's showed that their US sales are down. We're not only hitting their sales of cereal products and breakfast foods, but we're also hitting their snack foods, which include Pringles and Cheez-its and Keebler cookies. They're down across the board. If Americans can come together and speak collectively to force a big food manufacturer to change, the dominoes are going to fall. There will be a major impact on the entire food system because other companies are

going to be at a competitive disadvantage. They're going to be forced to follow suit.

Speaker 3: That's really the way to go?

Diana: I believe it is the way to go. I believe this is how we can win.

Speaker 3: What about letting our legislators know what we want and don't want? If Obama is looking to fast-track this ridiculous policy, this legislation that'll be really pro, it's only pro-corporation and anti-free will, really.

Diana: It certainly is.

Speaker 3: Do you know, is there anything that people can do to intervene?

Diana: People need to contact their legislators. They need to tell them that they want them to vote no on the TPP. They want no fast tracking and they don't want the TPP. We do a lot to get the word out. We've been doing Twitter storms every week, which a Twitter storm is where you set aside an hour and you spread the word through social media with other organizations, you all work together and explain what the TPP is on Twitter and get the word out about what people can do to stop the fast track and to stop the TPP. We reach thousands of people through Twitter as well as on Facebook, which we share there as well.

Speaker 3: Can you just tell me one more time, explain the TPP, what it stands for, what it is. Because it sounds too horrific for me. I keep thinking, I didn't hear this right.

Diana: Okay. The TPP is a transpacific partnership, which is a trade agreement. It involves the US, it involves Australia, it involves Canada, and a bunch of other countries that are transpacific. It has been actually written by corporations. It is being supported by the US government by President Obama. What it does effectively is it allows corporations to put corporate wealth ahead of human health. It supports big pharma. It supports the agrochemical industry. It supports GMOs. It would abolish GMO labeling as a barrier to trade.

It allows companies to sue countries that prohibit their products from entering the country for whatever reasons they have set forth. So that any country which has decided that it does not want GMOs, because they are an environmental risk because they are a

health risk, could be sued by Monsanto, and they potentially could use for keeping the products out and hurting the corporate profits.

Speaker 3: What about countries that aren't involved in this agreement, this trade agreement?

Diana: If this agreement goes through, it will only grow. There will be more of it.

Speaker 3: It's really for states within the countries who then disagree? If the UK signs this, that means the UK ...

Diana: No, the UK isn't involved. This is transpacific.

Speaker 3: It's transpacific. Oh, transpacific. Wow. Oh, that's right, oh my God. Okay, so Europe could still say we don't want you GMOs, and they're not going to be affected. Canada, if Quebec says we don't want GMOs and Canada had signed this, they're screwed.

Diana: Well, Tasmania. As I said, Tasmania is an Australian state. They just recently in the last week reaffirmed their ban of all GMOs including animals and plant matter. They would be at risk for being sued by Monsanto because they don't want GMOs in Tasmania. They want to keep it clean and green.

Speaker 3: And the state of Hawaii, so there's a few islands. I know Hawaii in the big island have decided no GMOs. They would also, they'd be sued. They'd have to sell it.

Diana: They'd be at risk, yes.

Speaker 3: They'd be at risk. Okay, so who is behind this do you know?

Diana: From what I understand, the TPP was written by corporations in the interest of corporations.

Speaker 3: Do we have all kinds of people on both sides of the aisle that are supporting this in terms of legislators?

Diana: The legislators are under a lot of pressure from the public not to support this agreement. I think they're starting to hear, we hope they're starting to hear because as I say, we do Twitter storms every week and we do a lot of social media information releases to educate the public and to ask them call their legislators and tell them no. No TPP, no TPP fast-track, we don't want this.

Speaker 3: Diana, can you tell me how you go about starting a social media campaign?

Diana: We spend a lot of time in the development of our campaigns. We choose our words very carefully, because we realize that the message that gets out with every single post has to be a complete message. We did our homework with Kellogg's. We sent a product to a lab so that we had proof to back up our claims that Kellogg's products contain GMOs. That is something that we have spent many, many hours designing informational posts to get out there. We selected a bunch of other Kellogg's products and we identified the GMO ingredients in those products based on the results of our Froot Loops test. We did a campaign that we did called connect the dots that we linked the products with the scientific research that raises concerns about the health hazards associated with the ingredients in those products.

Speaker 3: Tell me about your last posting.

Diana: One of the things you are provided with on Facebook and through social media is your reach. Last week we reached almost three and a half million people on Facebook.

Speaker 3: That is huge. How did that feel?

Diana: It felt great. It really felt like our message is getting out there. We share information and news, you know, unbiased and ask questions. What do you think of this? It felt great.

Speaker 3: Do you think your reach is growing each week or each month?

Diana: It's been going. Yeah, it's been growing consistently.

Speaker 3: That's wonderful. Can you tell me a little bit again, I know I asked you what got into here, into this movement, what prompted you. Could you maybe go into a little bit more detail about what prompted you on this quest, from a health standpoint?

Diana: I was already very involved with the movement. I started GM Free back at the very end of May after the bill died in 2012. Along the way, with our autoimmune diseases, I found that every time I would remove something from my diet, I would feel a little bit better. It was gluten, and then it was dairy, and then it was soy. Then I got to the point where I removed the GMOs because I knew

what was going on was not a good thing with our food. I didn't want that stuff in my body because I had read studies.

For example, a study on salmon that was done that showed up farm-raised salmon that ate genetically modified corn had autoimmune reactions in their gut. You make the connection, when you have autoimmune disease you say, "No, no, no, we're staying away from that." I was already free of GMOs in my diet. I was not strictly organic, just to clarify, but a lot of organics. I started having health problems again. I was diagnosed with chronic fatigue. I had digestive issues. I had low body temperature, I had brain fog. Every morning I would wake up with a horrible, horrible rotten taste in my mouth. It was like my gut was rotting. I looked like I was about six months pregnant. I wasn't eating a lot.

I couldn't understand what was wrong and why, because my diet was so clean. My doctor did a lot of blood work and he couldn't figure out what was wrong. He said, "You have chronic fatigue." That went on for probably close to a year. A couple of people had said to me, "Oh, check your vitamins, check your vitamins." I said oh, poo poo to that. My vitamins are fine. I buy from reputable companies. I can't imagine that could be a problem.

It got to the point where I was so tired of not being able to get out of the chair, I would literally just sit there all day long. I said, "Okay, we're going to check the vitamins." I made phone calls to the manufacturers and found that two of the vitamins that I was taking contained genetically modified ingredients. One of them was sourced from GMO corn. The other one contained traces of GMO soy. I switched them out to equivalent vitamins that were non-GMO. Within three weeks I felt like I had a new lease on life. My health improved dramatically. My gut is healing. It's been over a year now. It's been slow going, but now I no longer look like I'm six months pregnant. My brain fog has lifted. My body temperature has returned to normal, and I don't have chronic fatigue anymore.

Speaker 3: Wow, that's a wonderful story.

Diana: Three weeks is really when I started to see major improvement. That's the only change I made.

Speaker 3: Amazing. Amazing. You know, some people are just so sensitive. Who knows, there might be a lot of people out there that are

feeling terrible and hear this message and check their vitamins and change their food and really benefit thanks to you.

Diana: I hope so.

Speaker 3: Can you tell me if the health issue and the labeling issue and the GMO issues actually have touched you personally? I know that you talked about your health issues. From a personal level, is this more about wanting to educate the public? Or does this touch you at a deeper level?

Diana: 100%.

Speaker 3: 100%. Basically you're eating a bowl full of little loops that are consider pesticides by our government. They're just labeled, I mean, they're classified as pesticides.

Diana: [inaudible 00:42:36]

Speaker 3: How does that make you feel? And they're marketing this to children? This is what prompted you to put the pressure on Kellogg's?

Diana: It is. Farmers aren't going to grow it.

Speaker 3: Is it that it's cheaper for them to make this? Why do they make this here, and overseas it's non GMO? Interesting. This is really about protecting our children.

Diana: This is [inaudible 00:43:49].

Speaker 3: I see it as an entire experiment. It's experimenting with our children.

Diana: It certainly is.

Speaker 3: I get it. Diana, I heard that you won an award, and I'm wondering if you'd tell me a little bit about that.

Diana: I did, and it was an amazing experience. There's a wonderful nonprofit in California called Healthy Child Healthy World. They had a contest that they call moms on a mission, and they have it every year. From what I understand, there were over 100 nominees, and they got it down to 10, and then there was a public vote. I won. It was amazing.

Speaker 3: Oh, that's great.

Diana: It was amazing, because for me it not about me. It's about the movement. It was a victory for GMO awareness. They flew me out to California to speak at their banquet about my journey. When I was finished speaking, people came up to me, and even celebrities, there were many celebrities there. They said, "I will never buy another Kellogg's product for as long as I live." Because they had no idea that Kellogg's has these horrible GMOs inside.

Speaker 3: That's great.

Diana: Yeah, it was an amazing experience. I brought buttons with me, and I gave them all buttons so that they could wear boycott Kellogg's buttons when they go to the grocery store to educate other people and to help us grow the boycott. I would love to give you one and have you wear it every time you leave the house to help us grow the boycott.

Speaker 3: Thank you, I love it. It's great.

Diana: Thank you.

Speaker 3: Never leave home without it.

Diana: That's right. We also have been working with Baker Creek, which is an heirloom seed company. There are very, very wonderful people. They've printed us thousands of packets of seeds, which we are distributing around the country. They have enough a message about GMO Free USA. They also have a message on the back about heirloom seeds and why they are a symbol of freedom. Because Monsanto is trying to take away our freedom and control, our food supply.

Speaker 3: That's wonderful.

Diana: I'd love to give you one of those [crosstalk 00:45:44] as well.

Speaker 3: I'd love one, thank you.

Diana: As far as Kellogg's go, our social media campaign, it's not just on social media. We've taken the campaign to the streets, which is one of the things that as an activist organization we feel is very important. We on social media, we share information about their products, and we did a campaign that we call connect the dots.

What we did is we selected specific ingredients and linked certain scientific studies that have found health effects and health problems to the products to get the word out and educate people about what they're eating and what the risks are.

Beyond that, what we did last year around Earth Day which was quite interesting, we did a campaign around the country. We had people out on the streets in over 70 cities around the country to do a demonstration that we called a honk and wave. It was a very positive exercise. It was people smiling and waving and holding banners that said boycott Kellogg's, remove GMOs. We did it near, we did the honk and waves near supermarkets so that people who were shopping would be educated about the fact that Kellogg's does use GMOs in their products to help us grow the boycott.

On Earth Day, I actually traveled to Battle Creek, Michigan honk and wave across the street from Kellogg's headquarters. That was quite an experience which I would love to tell you about. It was me with a bunch of moms with toddlers and small children on the corner directly across from Kellogg's headquarters. If they looked out the windows, the front of the building is all glass, they could see us very clearly. We smiled and waved and handed out literature about GMOs and held proudly a very large banner that said Kellogg's remove GMOs.

When we were finished, I had a petition which had over 20,000 signatures at the time. It has since grown significantly. We went inside the building. I called and requested a meeting with John Bryant, Kellogg's CEO before. I was told that he was unavailable, but they would be happy to receive my petition. We went into the building to deliver the petition as well as some scientific studies that I printed out that showed that there is health harm from GMOs. The receptionist once I got inside didn't look me in the eye. She looked down, picked up the phone and said, "She's here."

I had previously sent Kellogg's several personal letters asking them to remove GMOs and explain my concerns and my health issues. They had been unanswered. Shortly after that, a gentleman came down the stairs, very imposing gentleman I guess in his 40s, tall and large build. He met me with a smile. I shook his hand and I said very graciously, "Thank you so much for taking the time to come and talk with me. I really appreciate it. I'd like you to have this petition. I have some information for Mr. Bryant about the health risks associated with GMOs." I told him about my concerns,

that they're being fed to children. Children are growing and children are vulnerable. I know from personal experience it has a negative effect on my health.

He shook my hand again and smiled and took the material and he went back up the stairs. I turned towards the receptionist and I said, "Thank you so much. Could you please tell me his title? I'd like to send him a thank you note." She looked at me and she said, "I'm not allowed to tell you." I went home and I looked Scott Lindahl up on LinkedIn. I found that he's Kellogg's global chief of security.

Speaker 3: Of course. I had a feeling that's who he was.

Diana: Of course. If you look at me, I'm a 56-year-old mom. I'm not a security threat to anyone. I just want safe food for children. That's what it's all about.

Speaker 3: I'm just curious. We're talking about Kellogg's. What about General Mills and Nabisco and Sarah Lee and some of these other big, I'm curious. Is it the same situation really?

Diana: I can only guess. I have personally sent a sample of Froot Loops to a laboratory for testing, so I can speak the facts as far as Kellogg's goes. I haven't tested products from any other manufacturer, so I don't know for sure. I also tested a box of MorningStar Chik Patties. I sent it to a toxicology lab. We found that it contained Roundup. The Roundup is getting into the food. It is definitely in there.

Speaker 3: Is that Kellogg's as well?

Diana: That is Kellogg's. Kellogg's owns MorningStar, yes.

Speaker 3: Interesting. They sent the chief of security to meet you, so I wonder what he did with those studies.

Diana: That's a good question. That's a very good question.

Speaker 3: Good for you. Wow, you are really a force to be reckoned with.

Diana: I will not stop until everyday children has safe food. That doesn't premium products like Kellogg's will tell you. Their [Kashi 00:50:16] products are GMO free, which they are not. There's a handful of Kashi, but if you go to the grocery store and look at the shelves, most Kashi products contain GMOs and they're charging premium

prices for them. I will not stop until children of all financial backgrounds have safe food.

Speaker 3: Good for you. I hope you don't stop. Thank you. Thank you for all you're doing. I want to thank you for inviting in your home and allowing me to be in your meeting. I would really love to know when and how you guys all got together to work on this issue.

Speaker 5: [00:50:53] What originally happened is Food & Water Watch from, which is a national organization focused on food and water issues sent green core advisors to the state of Washington to help set up groups to organize for the initiative 522. One of the groups was our Seattle group. We started last January. Most of us didn't know each other. There was one of the volunteers that came and helped us organize, she set up a place to meet, gave us some goals to work on. We had an agenda, gave us meeting structure, gave us training on how to move forward. That's how we got started. Many of those groups including our Seattle group is still functioning and working, even after the initiative.

Diana: You all started at the same time, pretty much?

Speaker 6: We got started in Kitsap little early. I was part of the collecting signatures too. I don't know, were you guys in on the collecting signatures?

Speaker 5: Some of us were.

Speaker 7: I was not.

Speaker 5: Yeah, I did some of that.

Speaker 3: When did all that start? How long ...

Speaker 5: In Kitsap, we didn't get a green core person. The one that would have been closest was in Tacoma, and they went away. We were on our own in Kitsap.

Speaker 3: When did that start?

Male: Signature gathering was all at the end of 2012.

Speaker 5: Yeah, the last part of that.

Speaker 7: In the middle of January it was announced that it was on the ballot for sure in Washington, and we got together in Seattle. When did you guys get together?

Speaker 6: Oh, counting back, it's been like 16 months of working on this. It was like August when we were starting to collect signatures. Then there was until January.

Speaker 3: Did you guys have an organized group out there too?

Speaker 6: Yeah, yeah.

Speaker 3: 16 months for you, and yours was earlier?

Speaker 6: That started on Facebook, getting people together.

Speaker 3: Interesting, okay.

Speaker 6: And through some different groups that are interested in GMOs.

Speaker 3: What have you all been doing the initiative dare I say failed? It failed, right?

Speaker 6: No, it really didn't fail because we've come a long way. You think about where we were at when we first started this. I would talk to people, as soon as I found out about the genetically modified food, I would talk to people on the street. I talked to people all over the place. Wherever I went, I talked to people. Out of 50 people, I noticed that maybe one would know something about genetically modified food. After we've done all this education, we've talked to so many people, we've had tabling and we've had movies come in and we've had speaker tours.

Now when I talk to people in my county, in Kitsap County, just about everybody knows something about it. There's very few that don't know anything about it. Some people are actually fairly well informed. It's turned around considerably. Kitsap County passed. Not to say that now I can hang up my gloves and say we're done. It's not like that. It's that we've come so far, let's keep it going. Because to me, it's important that mothers, especially mothers, because kid's bodies are changing so fast, the genetically modified food, it affects their bodies more than it would somebody who's been raised on good food most of their life. Some of these people who grew up on a farm or something like that and they've had good food all their life, and they don't really see that it's affecting her

grandchildren. But their grandchildren don't have the foundation like they do.

Speaker 5: Food's not the same as it used to be when I was a kid, or any of us were kids maybe.

Speaker 7: It's not the same as it was.

Speaker 5: No, no.

Speaker 3: Were you raised on good food? Or were you raised on ...

Speaker 7: I mean, I was raised on a budget, whatever that means in the context of ...

Speaker 3: Was it homemade food, or was it ...

Speaker 7: Yeah, I mean, we cooked from scratch.

Speaker 3: See, that's why you're so healthy.

Speaker 7: I don't think it was necessarily organic.

Speaker 3: It was cooked from scratch.

Speaker 7: We got a Safeway when I was like 13.

Speaker 6: That's the thing that I found is that I go to the grocery store, I watch people. That's just what I do. I watch people and I talk to people. I've noticed that the people who are shopping in the health food section, actually, that's how I found out about this. The people who are shopping in the health food section are going to the organic part of the grocery store, they're the healthiest people. That's what I've found, because I watched people and I go to the grocery store. The people who shop in the center of the grocery store, get the boxes, meals from boxes, those are the people who are in the worst shape. That's what I found when I talk to people.

Speaker 3: Of course, the boxed stuff, if it's not organic, since '97, '98, there's going to be some GMO in there, right?

Speaker 6: It's a huge percentage.

Speaker 3: It's a huge percentage now.

Speaker 5: What's it, over 80% of processed foods contain some genetically modified organism or ingredient.

Speaker 3: I would imagine at least.

Speaker 5: At least 80+ percent.

Speaker 3: What have you done, since the initiative didn't pass on November 5th, it had to be a huge emotional, I know that you see it as a game. I agree with you that if now more people are aware of GMO, they didn't even hear about it. Now there's awareness. It seems like maybe now if the vote was now, more people know about it. How are you regrouping? What's your plan? What are you going to do?

Speaker 5: Our plan is to keep going. What we've done last week, we've had a meeting of different groups including many people from the Seattle group and surrounding areas within the state to come together to talk about a debrief about what happened with 522. What worked, what didn't work, what we'd like to see different the next time. Also, the most important part I think is what's next for us.

Several ideas came aboard. One of them is a statewide campaign, education GMO campaign to take what we've initially, those thousands of people that now know a little bit about GMOs is to educate them a lot about GMOs, but not just GMOs, the food system in general. The chemicals that go along with it. The whole system is that the more awareness there is, there's more people we can get to join us where we can effectively change the entire system.

We also talked about boycotting certain products. Being able to vote with our dollars. The other thing we're talking about is something called WAmend. It's the movement to amend the Constitution that corporations aren't people. Washington state is looking to put an initiative on the ballot next year and to start gathering signatures starting next month to get that on the ballot to put forth that Washington state residents want a constitutional amendment that corporations aren't people, money isn't speech to, in order to get money out of politics. Which many of us feel is an umbrella issue. Because once you get hold of corporate control, then the democracy can come back the way it was intended to be.

Speaker 3: That begs the question, and I know you guys haven't done a postmortem yet on the initiative. It sounds like that's coming

Speaker 5: A little bit. We started that last week, yeah.

Speaker 3: Why would that not fail to? Because wouldn't you have the same pushback from the industry spewing the same kind of misinformation so people don't vote the way you'd want them to? Why do you think your initiative failed?

Speaker 7: I think we had a really geographical disparity. Everybody in this room was working in counties that did pass. The counties that didn't pass didn't have strong groups like ours. Or they had groups that asked for help and didn't get as much help as they needed. I think a lot of people in counties that we weren't working in personally weren't as convinced that labeling would really change much in the food system. I think there was a really strong, the no campaign was very strong. They sent out a lot of mailers that came into people's houses and told them that their food was going to cost more. That was terrifying to them. I think for this next round, we'll be able to appeal more to people that we didn't put so much effort into reaching this time around.

Speaker 5: I think that's true. I think unfortunately the official campaign, because they're an official campaign, they went with the graphics and where they could win it. They missed some populations like senior citizens and conservatives. Unfortunately, if we had earlier time targeting some of those groups, I think we would have been more successful. The other issue I think, even though we worked closely with the campaign and supported the campaign, we felt there was some difference with the messaging. As a grassroots, we came at it from an approach that we wanted to educate people about this topic, where the campaign wanted a similar message about the right to know and focused on that and didn't really focus on the safety or environmental or any of the other issues that go along with GMOs, because it's a big topic. It's huge.

They didn't want to go down that road. We weren't afraid to go down that road because we're citizens and we want to educate other citizens and people because we're trying to change the entire system. Labeling, and I can speak for myself. Labeling is just one piece of this in order to take back control of our food system. We need to keep going. The education campaign that we're talking about creating throughout the state can be replicated

elsewhere is one of the biggest interests that came out of last week's meeting. I think we're going to be moving forward on that.

Speaker 6: I know from interviewing somebody from Connecticut, they were quite successful in their own way. What they did, with that group they had 26 people that went around the state and held lectures and educational meetings at libraries, public libraries. That seemed to be a really good way to educate people. I think if you're saying that, it sounds almost like people voted no because they were afraid of the prices. That's really be a false ...

Speaker 7: People are really afraid.

Speaker 6: Right, about the cost part of it. It seems to be a false, that's misinformation because my understanding, and you all probably know better. Because so many countries don't allow GMOs to come in over the want to sell, they have to have it labeled all along the chain. It doesn't cost them any extra to have things labeled. That was really kind of a made up ...

Speaker 5: There's also a bigger debate about that of food cost, which is about sourcing, be able to get sources for non GMO products. Because many of these companies know once you get a label on there, you're going to have to change something up like they did in Europe. Because they were rejected in Europe. That's why many products in Europe don't contain GMOs anymore because they labeled them. Customers didn't buy them. They took them out.

Similar thing happening here, they don't want that to happen. Organizations like the Grocery Manufacturers Association that dumped a huge amount of money in funneled a bunch of money in Coke and Pepsi and Nestle and Kellogg's and all the rest of them had a source of money. Monsanto, I mean, they have such a wealth of money. They can pretty much buy the election at this point.

I think things are changing. They're getting closer and closer to losing. It's going to hit Oregon next, Colorado. Both are going to be doing initiatives next year. We're going to be supporting those states as well. That's another thing that many of us are going to be doing, supporting other state's efforts. We'll see what happens. It's only a matter of time before we get labeling. The bigger umbrella issue is these corporate control of our food system to the point where we really, we have to go back to growing our own food and sourcing our own ingredients to be able to get safe food these

days. Not everybody can afford that. Hardly anybody can afford that.

Speaker 3: I think that's why so many cooperatives are popping up. People are buying [crosstalk 01:03:07] again.

Speaker 5: And farmer's markets.

Speaker 3: And farmer's markets because they want to be able to source pure sources. It is expensive.

Speaker 6: I was at a co-op meeting last night, and we're working on it in Kitsap. We don't have a good food source in Kitsap so much, in Kitsap County. They worked with us a lot on this. With the tour, we had a tour with Howard [Vlieger 01:03:31] and Pam Leary from California.

Speaker 3: Howard did research, is Howard the one that's done [crosstalk 01:03:36] knows about the research that can tell me about his research?

Speaker 6: He did research with Judy Carmen out of Australia. She's a scientist down in Australia. Basically what they did is they followed pigs throughout a lifetime study, feeding study. They fed one group GMO, one group not GMO over the lifetime of the pigs as soon as the pigs were weaned.

Male: Up to slaughter.

Speaker 6: Up to slaughter, yeah. I forgot, up to ...

Speaker 3: That is their life.

Speaker 6: Up to adulthood 'till they slaughter and kill them and eat them.

Male: Which is not even, that's really only like a quarter of their life.

Speaker 6: Yeah, you're right, yeah.

Male: Natural life.

Speaker 6: Yeah, natural life. Then they dissected them and did autopsies on them and basically focused on their stomachs and showed the significant difference between the non GMO fed and the GMO fed pigs.

Speaker 3: What was the difference?

Speaker 6: Oh, lesions, what is it, inflammation was huge. As most people know, inflammation is usually the beginning causes of diseases. Inflammation, what else did they find? Lesions.

Male: The measurable effect was the weight of the stomach.

Speaker 7: That was the weight of the uterus, not the stomach.

Speaker 6: The uterus, it was the uterus.

Speaker 7: The uteruses of female pigs that were fed GE foods were 25% heavier on average, the female pigs of course.

Speaker 3: Wow, interesting.

Speaker 7: Than the non GMO fed.

Speaker 5: That was published earlier this year, wasn't it? Or last year.

Speaker 6: It was earlier this year.

Speaker 7: I think it was 2013.

Speaker 3: Did they find tumors as well?

Speaker 5: Lesions that I think were pre-tumorous or precancerous or something. I can't remember.

Speaker 7: I always just thought it was ulcers.

Speaker 5: It could be ulcers.

Speaker 7: I'm not sure that they found tumors. That was a fairly new study.

Speaker 5: Yeah, I don't think it was, it might have been precancerous stuff, but it wasn't cancer.

Speaker 7: The pigs are only 22 weeks old. They're not very old.

Speaker 3: It was a really short span of their life that they ...

Speaker 5: Up to slaughter, yeah.

Speaker 3: Okay.

Speaker 6: One of the things that I found really interesting about this study that he was talking about was when he would have this thing set up, because they had to weigh the pigs, and they would have a little trail set up, because once the pigs got bigger they couldn't just pick them up and carry them. They had this little maze type thing set up for the pigs. He noticed that the pigs that were fed the GM feed, they couldn't handle that maze. They weren't smart enough to handle that maze as the pigs that weren't fed.

Speaker 5: And confused and agitated.

Speaker 6: They were confused and mean. Yeah, it's very interesting.

Speaker 5: Where the ones that were fed non-GMO had no problem going through the maze.

Speaker 6: Yeah, they thought it was fun.

Speaker 3: I think I've read that. That sounds so familiar. That's so fascinating, isn't it? Do you know if some of the other research that's been done? I know that you all are really, I mean, this is your issue.

Speaker 6: Sarah Leeney.

Speaker 3: Sarah Leeney?

Male: The other issue that the no side had that was really successful was that the fear that if you voted no, if you voted yes on the initiative, that you were going to hurt small farmers. That resonated with a lot of people. I think that people didn't want to hurt small farmers. We didn't have too much of a counter argument against that other than it was sponsored by small farmers. The whole initiative was brought on by a pea farmer.

Speaker 5: A wheat farmer.

Male: A wheat farmer?

Speaker 5: Tom Stall.

Male: Tom Stall in Eastern Washington. That was his whole issue was that he wanted to save Washington agriculture.

Speaker 3: You mean the initiative to vote for labeling?

Male: He was the one that put the initiative to vote yes on the initiative.

Speaker 5: And a part of the steering committee.

Male: Yeah, he was a big part of the whole campaign. The voters got confused by the overwhelming number of times that they heard from two farmers that said that it's going to hurt small farmers. There were so many other farmers out there, if you actually talked to the farmers that I talked to, they were all in favor of it.

Speaker 6: All those ads were paid for by ...

Speaker 3: Again, the money, you said something about how little of the money came from in-state. Who knows the details on that?

Male: There were like, I had seen it. There were three people, four people, five people that gave \$550.

Speaker 6: total.

Male: That was it. No side.

Speaker 5: From the in-state, yeah.

Male: Everything else was corporate dollars.

Speaker 3: Wait, how much was in-state versus out-state? Against the initiative.

Male: Five people in the state contributed to the no campaign.

Speaker 3: That's it, five people in the whole state?

Male: Five people. That was \$550.

Speaker 3: Total?

Male: Total. There were \$22 million that was being put forward to give us an onslaught of TV commercial, like every commercial break you'd probably see two commercials on the no side. \$22 million from out of state. They would even come back and say that this was, the yes side was a whole bunch of out of state money. It was really the no side that was the out of state money.

Speaker 3: First of all, who were the in-state and who were the out of state?

Male: Let's go with the out of state first. Big corporations like Monsanto, Dow. All of these agricultural companies that sell GMO seeds, those

were the guys that were worried they were going to lose market share. They were the ones that put in millions of dollars.

Speaker 5: And the GMA.

Male: Grocery Manufacturers Association who represented PepsiCo, Coca-Cola. I don't remember who else.

Speaker 5: Kellogg's, Nestles. All the junk food people.

Male: Kraft.

Speaker 5: Kraft.

Male: Yeah, it was all processed food folks that were concerned they were going to have to label their foods.

Speaker 3: Oh my God.

Speaker 6: The problem is that some of those companies also have organic companies within those companies. A lot of these organic companies have actually been bought out by the big companies like Coca-Cola and PepsiCo and stuff like that. Cornucopia has a great graph that shows you the big companies that have bought all these great companies that we used to rely on for our organics. Now I'm not going to go buy my stuff from them when they go and spend the money on wrecking our hopes of getting genetically modified food labeled. I'm just going to do that. I'll go for companies that, like Nature's Path and Nutiva. On and on, all these great companies that help us get labels.

Male: Not just help us get labels but I think are local, are sustainable. They support people.

Speaker 6: They have integrity.

Male: They have integrity. It's the small companies that really have the correct message, the correct intention I feel like. It's these big companies that are don't care about people. They care about corporations.

Speaker 5: It's about money. It's profit over people at all costs.

Speaker 7: The other thing about the Grocery Manufacturers donations were that they were funneled through the Grocers Manufacturers

Association. It wasn't Nestle coming out and saying we don't support organic labeling. It was them hiding it under the rug and getting this association to project that. That was kind of ...

Speaker 5: They have a plan. They actually have a long term plan, the Grocery Manufacturers to basically go after any state efforts to labeling. They came out when, because the GMA was sued by the attorney general of Washington state because of not disclosing their donors. Because they funneled it through and they never registered as an official PAC. Because they figured out this scheme. They realized the cost of doing business, it'll be cheaper for us to pay fines.

Because these companies did not want to be exposed, because when they were exposed in California on prop 37, people started boycotting them. They didn't want the same thing to happen. They figured the GMA would be their cover, their front group so they could funnel all their money in there like Coke and Pepsi and all the others, which they did. Then they were forced to disclose who their donors were, which are everybody we just named. It's still happening right here now. We don't know what the long term outcome is going to be by this lawsuit that the attorney general has against the GMA right now.

Speaker 3: That's going on at the moment?

Speaker 5: Yes.

Speaker 3: Wow.

Male: They're going to trial in January I think.

Speaker 5: That started a couple months, yeah. We don't know what it's going to, how it will affect the election. We think that they're probably just going to get fined, a slap on the hand, and then they'll just keep doing it as a cost of doing business. Ideally I'd like to see them void the election and us give us another shot at it in 2015.

Speaker 3: Couldn't you take another shot at it anyway?

Speaker 5: The plan is the official steering committee for the yes on 522 campaign are already talking about doing another run in 2016. They feel that we lost not just because of all the money, which was a big component of that, but that it was an off election year. If we had better turn out, we would have won. Because King County where we live in Seattle is the most populous county. We won

hands down. That's why at the night of the election was 10 points apart, now it's two points apart because all those votes had. If we had a better voter turnout, a different election year, we may have been able to pull it off. That's what the official campaign is saying. Now they're planning on doing another run in 2016.

Male: If this movie comes out before 2016, maybe we'll convince the people that the corporations are not really on their side.

Speaker 5: The other thing is the official campaign is now talking about doing is doing a more education-focused thing this time, which is what we said, "You got to do an education campaign."

Speaker 6: Which is necessary. It seems like to hold Connecticut I think as a model, because they were so successful, that is really what their MO was was education.

Speaker 5: Not just there but if you look at the counties that passed in Washington like Clallam, Kitsap, Jefferson which tend to be more senior-oriented, more conservative all passed. That was because people were on the ground educating people for a long time even up before the initiative. We know education works. We know it does. Now we just have to put it into action and keep running with it.

Speaker 6: It's the run-up. I think that one of the things that really hurt us is that we had a lot of lag time, if Food & Water Watch hadn't come in we would have been sunk. We had a lot of lag time between the labeling, it was called label it law. That was the signature gathering part. Then the official campaign getting started, some people were just lost in that and just probably never even came back. I think it's really important that if you're going to be getting signatures, you're talking to people anyway. You might as well see, are you in it for the long haul?

Speaker 3: There's no grassroots group of Washington citizens who lobby for no labeling. You know what I mean?

Speaker 6: There was no citizens doing that.

Male: The campaign night when they won, there was like, Dana Beaver.

Speaker 6: Dana Beaver.

Male: She was the campaign spokesperson. She came out, and there was nobody in the crowd except for a bunch of reporters.

Speaker 3: How did she show her face?

Male: I don't know. I really don't know, I wasn't there.

Speaker 6: She spoke to like a group, one person, and then somebody with a camera.

Speaker 5: She's not that tough. Unfortunately, I think we needed to be a little tougher. I just think that the message needs to get stronger and tougher. I mean, I think we need to be scaring the hell out of the people with the truth. That's how we're going to make change. Because if you don't tell people what's really going on and get them to pay attention to it, nothing's going to change. We don't need everybody. We just need enough of us to get a tipping point to drag the rest of them with us. We're getting close. I can feel it. I think we're going to hit it. Within the next year or two we're going to have a tipping point where we're going to see a major shift in a food system and the way we do things that I'm very optimistic about.

The bottom line is the more people know about this, the more they will change their spending habits. They change, they start buying something different, all of a sudden you start changing the food system. Because if that's all they know is money, then our biggest thing we can do is change that whole dynamic and start putting our money where it needs to go. Farmer's markets, local farms, supporting local people, encouraging young people to become farmers and encouraging everyone to care about our food system. That's how we're going to change everything. Voting with our dollars is essential. That's why we're talking about some of these boycotts with these companies are dumping to preventing us from knowing. You know what, their shares are going down. We are having an effect on that. I think we need to keep growing that and teach people how to do that.

Speaker 3: You mentioned that in Europe when there was labeling, people opted not to buy it. There's no GMO food in most of those countries. It works, but we have to get to that point. You're right, that's great that the shares are going down. I love hearing that.

Speaker 5: They are. Monsanto, seed sales went down for the first quarter since they started selling seed. The fact that that's happening, some farmers are moving away from buying the seed because they're realizing the long-term effects are not worth it, and they're also seeing changes. You're having to use more chemicals because nature adapts. You're getting super weeds and superbugs. They have to dump more chemicals on there. What is it, the EPA just raised the level of glyphosate you could throw out there just because they needed to put more on there. At some point the system's going to break. I think we're getting closer and closer to that. People like us here in this room are making sure we step on their back as much as we can to help break them.

Speaker 3: That's great.

Speaker 5: I'd like to see Monsanto go down.

Speaker 3: I think we're far from seeing that. Many people would love that.

Speaker 5: I would disagree with you. I think we're closer to that than you think.

Male: I was going to put a short order on Monsanto, basically betting that their stock was going to go down in price. I'm glad I didn't because ...

Speaker 7: Do you have stock in Monsanto?

Male: I do not. You can bet against the stock going down.

Speaker 5: If you did, you'd get a lot of harassment from our group.

Speaker 6: You know, somebody actually bought stock from, Monsanto stock so they could go to the [crosstalk 01:19:01] and protest at the meeting. That is a way to do it is if anybody bought small amount and showed up out, a lot of people, like 500 people, 1000 people showed up.

Male: There is a problem with our culture these days is that shareholders really do not get heard, the board the CEO basically.

Speaker 6: They got heard. They showed up. They got it on film. They got it on film and it was all over the Internet. That's pretty cool.

Male: Their voice does not register.

Speaker 5: I do think that a lot of these companies are running a little scared. I think they're scrambling to figure out what the hell they're going to do next. Because as you see the demand for organic and food without GMOs out there, companies, natural food companies are scrambling to find sources. All of a sudden there is to be a hiccup or two in the food system when things begin to change. I mean, that's going to happen. I think it's for the better. I think through that process is we're going to find a more sustainable, equitable system. Because let's face it, the system as it is now, it also exploits people on top of everything else it does. Not to mention what it does to the environment.

Speaker 3: When you say it exploits people, what exactly are you referring to?

Speaker 5: When you think about farm workers for example. They're the ones that are exposed to these chemicals firsthand and they're getting sick. There's some things going down, in, what is it, Yakima in Washington state. There's a huge increase in birth defects with some of these people that are living around the farm communities and they're part of the farm communities. Huge increase in birth defects in that area. I think it has to do with the chemicals that they're being exposed to. They're directly in contact and they're getting sick all the time, but nobody pays attention to them because either they're illegal or people think, oh, they're from another country so they don't matter. They do matter, we all matter. Those are the people we need to be bringing in. To be bringing everybody, because this is a people issue. The corporations have just run amok. We need to rein them in.

Speaker 3: I have not heard really very much from you. They say that you are normally the spokesperson. I'd love to know what got you into this group to begin with. What's your passion around this?

Male: It's basically that the science just hasn't been done. The FDA has never performed or required a single independent safety test on genetically engineered food. The basis by which they determine genetically engineered foods are safe is built on laughable and unscientific policy called substantial equivalence. Substantial equivalence, if we applied it to any other portion of the food industry, we would consider it completely unusable. If you applied substantial equivalence to beef for instance, cow with BSE or bovine spongiform encephalopathy, otherwise known as mad cow disease would be substantially equivalent to a healthy cow. It

would have the same protein and carbohydrates and vitamins as beef as would a healthy cow.

It's obviously not safe. It's not safe to eat beef that's contaminated with BSE. We're using that rubric and applying it to genetically engineered food. We're saying because genetically engineered corn has the same protein, carbohydrates, and vitamin A as its conventional counterpart, it must be safe. That's not scientific and it's not proof of safety. If not proof of healthy food. The FDA has really let us down.

Speaker 3: That's really, really well, I've never heard it anyone put it so well, but it's so clear when you say it like that. I really get it. I have a question because I also thought that when I've read Michael Pollan's books, I also thought that he mentioned that once these foods are genetically modified and they've got certain equivalence to some of the pesticides let's say, that the FDA no longer is categorizing as food. They're now like potato. Some of these genetically modified potatoes are now under jurisdiction of the EPA as pesticide.

Male: Yeah. Bt corn or corn that's been bred with the toxic protein of *Bacillus thuringiensis* is not actually controlled by our government as a food source. It's actually controlled as a pesticide because it actually contains the toxic protein from Bt. How can we apply this policy of substantial equivalent genetically engineered food when their genes are able to be patented by the biotech industry.

Speaker 3: They're patented, so they're protected as being very different, correct?

Male: Yeah.

Speaker 3: Yet we're told they're ...

Male: You have a real disconnect the FDA's policy of substantial equivalence and the patent office's policy of recognizing a unique and owned gene. We've taken thousands of years of genetic history and changed one tiny portion. Now all of a sudden a single corporation has control over that entire genome.

Speaker 6: Yeah, they didn't do anything great to it. They ruined it, and now they can patent it. At least that's how I look at it.

Speaker 3: It's not just one tiny genome that they switch. It's not like a recessive allele, it's not like a recessive trait. They took another species. They've taken ...

Speaker 6: It's transgenetic.

Speaker 3: It's a transgenetic species, so that doesn't happen in nature ever.

Speaker 5: The industry is very schizophrenic. They're over at the FDA, perfectly just like everything else. Then they're over at the patent office going, it's completely different than anything else. It's completely schizophrenic, and yet it's happening all the time.

Speaker 3: That brings up a good question, and you touched on it. That's the question of the FDA. The FDA, are they working for us? Are they working for people? Are they working for the industry? What do you all think?

Speaker 6: That's the problem is that there's a revolving door between the two. Somebody goes and works for Monsanto as say a lawyer or something, and then they go and they work for the FDA or the USDA.

Speaker 5: Or [crosstalk 01:25:13] the Supreme Court.

Speaker 6: Yeah, exactly.

Speaker 5: Michael Taylor who's, what is it, the second in charge of the FDA, he's been back and forth between the USDA, Monsanto, FDA back and forth. He was instrumental in helping craft the thing that, what is it, GRAS, generally recognized as safe idea about GMOs back in 1992. He's one of the lawyers that worked on that. He's been in it from the beginning. I don't think there's anybody looking out for us out there.

Speaker 3: The concept of GRAS, generally regarded as safe isn't new. It's not a new concept. It's just a concept that the GMOs have been able to grandfather into. That's how aluminum looked at. There's a lot of things that are used in vaccine and drugs that there's no safety studies on. Because we're told that they have GRAS, they're accepted as GRAS, so he brought it in, let's bring in these as GRAS. It's easy. You don't think the FDA, it's the FDA. They're supposed to be working for us on our tax dollars.

Speaker 5: No, they're working for the corporations.

Speaker 6: Look at the cigarette industry. Look at the tobacco industry. Look at cigarettes. Everything else had to be labeled. Anything we had to eat had to be labeled. It had to tell you all the different fats and sugars everything. they didn't have to label cigarettes for years.

Speaker 3: You had doctors in the MA actually promoting and saying they were safe.

Speaker 5: The same thing was happening, it's tobacco science, isn't it really what they're doing? They're pretending it's science or they put out just enough science to say this is okay. I mean, that's just the tip.

Male: It's not independent.

Speaker 5: It's not independent and they only give you this tiny piece they want you to see and they don't let you know all the other information underneath it. Where I think that's probably going get exposed soon or later.

Speaker 6: The thing is that the science, there's all this science. Everybody needs the science. We need more studies. Yes, I love Sarah Leeney for what he did. I'm so thankful that we have scientist like [inaudible 01:27:22] Sarah Leeney. These people that have our backs that are trying to find out what's wrong with the food, I'm thankful for them. What I notice is that in my own children, as soon as I found out about genetically modified food, I went through my cupboard and I started calling up companies and asking them, do you source genetically modified crops in your product? Time after time they said, "Yes, we do." The reason why they said they do this because the FDA said it's okay.

It's not okay with me that they changed something that I was using because my mom used it. I was fine on it. My kids weren't fine on it. When I found out about the genetically modified food, there was this big piece, this big aha moment. I've got the GMOs out of our food. We still ate things from boxes, but at least it was organic stuff. I did some things from scratch. That means making it myself, getting the ingredients myself. We do some things scratch. Some things, it's nice to be able to get spaghetti sauce in a jar sometimes when you're running short on time. Now it's organic spaghetti sauce in a jar.

Anyway, I noticed a difference in my kids. My son was not overweight or anything like that, but he was getting a little chubby, he dropped five pounds. He's a growing boy, he dropped five pounds. Now he's just growing like a normal boy. My daughter drops some weight. I dropped 45 pounds. My husband dropped 35 pounds. This is in the first year of knowing about genetically modified food. It has been a huge thing for my family. The weight was just one little portion of it. It's the overall health.

Speaker 3: The weight's a big portion of it.

Speaker 6: The weight is a big portion.

Speaker 3: That alone, boy, I'm telling you. In Washington state, I don't know if you have a fat state. If you have a fat state, that alone would get the initiative passed because ...

Speaker 6: They didn't want us to talk about the health issues.

Speaker 3: Yeah, you mentioned that earlier. I want to know, what was that about?

Speaker 6: The thing is they did Poland. Maybe you can talk more about the big ...

Male: The paid campaign, the paid campaign ran a campaign based on what they understood about how politics works and how they thought they could successfully prosecute a campaign like this in Washington. What happened at the expense of that was the independent voices in Washington were shut out by the paid campaign, which is unfortunate. In addition, the paid campaign was not really able to do everything that they could have to succeed in this state. One of those things was keep up with the social demand for information and access to materials.

We were in a position where we had to print our own materials. We couldn't rely on the paid campaign. Even though they had six million dollars, they decided it would politically expedient to spend that money on television commercials, which I can't really argue with. If you've done a campaign before and you've been successful and you've won, that's the thing that you're going to go to and the thing you're going to want to do. They spent a lot of time doing focus groups and finding out what worked well with these groups of people. That really limited their message and

prevented a lot of curious people from getting access to more depth of knowledge about the issue.

That's where I think the grassroots actually succeeded. I think we have to admit that we failed. We won in King County 60% of the vote. It doesn't really mean that much if we lost the entire state. A lot of that had to do with the way the paid campaign decided to allocate their resources. A lot of that had to do with certain people just assuming it was going to pass because we're a progressive state and we elect Democrats. That doesn't really mean any a ballot initiative. It was a nonpartisan issue, and really everyone should have been on board with this issue. They were for a long time before the wealth of money came in.

If the paid campaign had been able to reach out to really excited individuals who didn't want to just call people on the phone and tell them why they should vote yes on I 522, these are people who wanted to organize events in their city or host a debate with their nutritionist group, the campaign wasn't capable of responding to them in a way that they needed to, providing them with resources. That was like I think one of the hugest failures. When people were trying to engage and really get involved in the issue and really advance the initiative, the paid campaign wasn't able to respond to them in an effective way.

Speaker 3: You would do things different, I'm sorry. Go on.

Speaker 7: Further, the paid campaign was pretty clear that there wasn't that much science to independent third-party studies about the health effects of genetically engineered foods. Then they stopped there. They didn't address at all why there aren't studies or what's behind that and what the studies have been done have been found and why we might be curious about further studies. That was kind of a big failure in my opinion.

Male: Their focus group said, their focus told them the thing that wins voters over is saying you have the right to know what's in your food. They took that idea and abandoned the intricacies of talking about our food supply as a whole.

Speaker 3: Or the science.

Male: Or the science, because it takes a long time to it's how some science been done and a lot of science hasn't been done. Instead of

saying there are no independent scientific studies prove the safety of genetic engineering, they said, "We're not here to talk about the science. We just want to give people the right to know." Because that was the message that was successful in their focus group.

Speaker 3: Interesting. I understand that, because science is complex and some people don't understand it at all. There has been studies, but there's not a lot. Why isn't there a lot? What about, you mentioned Terry Rain, the insider. What do the insider whistle blowers say?

Speaker 6: I've never been a fan, I hate to say it because I know that some people, some scientists are very set on these scientific studies, they're so important. I've never been a fan of scientific studies. I like animals too much. When it came between the rats and my kids, I would rather have the studies done on my rats than my kids being the scientific experiment. One of the signs that has really caught the movement is this little girl with a sign, I am not a scientific experiment. That's been duplicated in march after march. Really, I would rather that they do the studies on these animals, but we're eating this stuff now.

You can see it. You can see the difference the children. Teachers can see the difference, teachers who have been in teaching for a long time, they can tell you the difference between a classroom that they have now and a classroom that they had 20 years ago. There's a big difference in the number of kids that are not able to classroom setting, because they have to move around all the time. Just all kinds of problems. I was talking to somebody out of a class of 28 kids, 20 of those kids had some kind of a learning problem. Maybe it was undiagnosed, but they had a difficulty. There were plenty of whistle blowers out there like Terry Rain in Canada who have come out and said that there are definitely problem with this. He's done some great work getting the information out there to people at a TEDx talk.

Speaker 3: Yes. Terry Rain, I would love to talk to him. Clearly, he's probably got a wealth of information. it's interesting because I'm going around interviewing people on a few subjects. They all say the same thing. Everybody, the science isn't there. The science that is there that might be negative for the industry is suppressed, that the FDA doing the job, that we need more science to show safety. It's all the same message. It doesn't matter if we're talking about GMOs or psych meds.

Male: I had a thought that if we could label our food, we could be a scientific study. Right now, we're not really a scientific study. If they labeled it, we could epidemiological studies, population-wide studies, and actually do the analysis. That's all we're asking label it so one, we can choose, but two, then epidemiologists could actually analyze and show that people that do eat GMOs have this effect. People that don't eat GMOs don't have that effect. I think that would be a huge thing. All we're asking for is to label it. We're not asking them to ban it, just label it so we can choose. If you go to your doctor and you say I have some gastrointestinal distress, your doctor can't ask you, "Are you eating GE food?" Because nobody knows. If it's not labeled, how are we ever going to know?

Speaker 3: You're eating it if it's ...

Speaker 5: If you don't know about it, you're eating it.

Speaker 3: Most doctors don't even bother asking that because they're not even informed about the subject.

Male: Yeah, they just listen to the broad voice. If you look at the alternative medicine community, people go to their doctors, maybe see two or three of them, maybe see a gastroenterologist. Gastroenterologist. Enterologist, thank you. People who go see their doctors, they can't diagnose their problem, can't help them out. Then they go to see a naturopath or some alternative medicine doctor who takes the GE food out of their diet. They get better for so many different levels. Whether it's their gastrointestinal system or eczema. There's a mountain of anecdotal evidence in the alternative medicine community.

Speaker 3: Oh, but the [inaudible 01:38:13] would say that anecdotal evidence means nothing. I have to say on that point is that we know that ...

Male: Well, it does.

Speaker 6: [crosstalk 01:38:20] means everything.

Speaker 3: Glyphosate and the neonicotinoids, all these things have an effect on the bacteria that live in your gastrointestinal. It's a huge part of your immune system.

Speaker 5: Which it affects mood.

Speaker 3: Which it affects behavior, autoimmunity, all those things.

Speaker 6: Farmers thought thought that it was fine, because the glyphosate affects the shikimate pathway of the plant. We don't have a shikimate pathway, but our gut bacteria does.

Speaker 3: Yes, they do.

Male: That's 90% of the population of our cells.

Speaker 3: There's been a lot of attention on the shikimate, people read about it in the New York Times now. The first time I saw that I'm like, I never heard that term before. In the last few months, the biome and all the bacteria, which I've been practicing alternative medicine for 20 years. I've always focused on the gut and replenishing the bowel flora. This is making its way into the mainstream consciousness. This is so different. This is so radical right now. It is coming into the consciousness and to the mainstream. If the New York Times Sunday magazine is talking about bowel flora and the shikimate cycle that's in your bowel flora, maybe we're ready for a change. Maybe this is the tip.

Speaker 5: We're reaching. We're getting those. We're getting close.

Male: There's so many things that we don't know. We just learned about the shikimate pathway just within the last few years. There's so much we don't know. How can we be so presumptuous to feel like we can change the DNA of plants and organisms on our planet and then eat them and not have any effect.

Speaker 3: It seems ignorant, doesn't it? On a big level like this thing of like, how would you not? It's such a logical conclusion come to that that if you do that, you're going to disrupt things. there's no sense of that, like what you're doing.

Male: To me as a botanist, all of the invasive plants that we have experienced, Asian carp in the Mississippi or Missouri or wherever it's at.

Speaker 6: And Lake Michigan, almost.

Male: Yeah. All of these in our area, Scotch broom, Himalayan blackberry, just invasive plants everywhere. Have we not learned a thing about all of the invasive issues? Here we are designing new species that are going to be spread their genetic pollution around, and they're going to be the new invasives.

Speaker 3: You're a botanist?

Male: Yeah. I'm an engineer and a botanist.

Speaker 3: That's really cool. I have to ask you, because the industry says, and those proponents of the industry will say that you're against progress if you're not for the science lab altering our food, altering our genetics, that you're actually anti-science if you even question the safety of GMOs, in fact.

Speaker 5: We get that a lot.

Male: There's many different perspectives on science. One view of science could just be that narrow view of their lab table and the cool things that they can do at the lab. What is the effect on our world? That's the other end of science that I'm concerned about.

Speaker 5: Where's the ethics in it? There's nobody talking about the ethical ramifications are, messing with DNA to the point where we don't know. I really think we haven't even begun to see the effects of what this genetic modification has done in our food system. We will probably all be long before those effects even really kick in. We don't know. It's up to us, I have grandchildren. I'm very concerned about, when they're my age, is there going to be safe food to eat? Safe water, air, this is all connected. The chemicals that they're using not just our food system but across the board are accumulating. Just because, oh, this much in this amount is okay and this much in this amount, but now you're mixing all this kind of stuff. It's this cocktail of chemicals that we have no idea. Then the genetic manipulation on top of that, we have no idea what it's going to look like in 50 years from now, 100 years from now.

Speaker 6: Yeah, we're all a bunch of chemical soup.

Speaker 3: Yeah. You had made a comment like, that it's haughty for us to presume, or presumptuous, that was what you were implying. The implication also is maybe that the industry was doing it to better mankind. Do you think the, it's hard for me to keep a straight face when I say that. Do you think the industry is creating all these things because they truly believe it's better?

Male: Do they believe it's better? When I was going through botany school, I thought it was kind of cool that you could genetically modify things, because you could do it. I think they're doing it

because they can do it and because they can make some money off of it. I'm not sure that GMOs are really a green revolution. I don't think that they're really increasing the crop yield of anything. I really don't think that they're saving the planet with GMOs.

There's a lot of people that come out and say, "Yeah, we need GMOs to feed the world." That's not feeding the world. It's not GMOs that is increasing crop yield at all. It's more fertilizers yielding better crop yields. It's not genetically modified crops. Genetically modified crops are basically feeding more money into the pockets of the people that have patented those crops. That's really the only impetus that I see for having GMOs out there right now is these guys are fighting their patented material so that they can keep on making money on it.

Speaker 5: This quest for money will create these corporations that are willing to do just about anything at the expense of anybody, anything, the environment, even probably knowingly hurting people, but they don't care because they're making money. That's such a disconnect for me personally, because I want to connect more with people and our community. This is a complete different way of viewing the world that I just don't get. This quest for money to the extent that they're willing to just cause all this damage. I don't get that.

Speaker 3: There's no moral compass. There's this loss of moral ...

Male: It's not people, it's corporations that are making the decision. Corporations, the CEO has the directive of causing this corporation to make as much money as he can. Even if the CEO has a grand idea of wiping out pesticides, he has to make money for this corporation in any way he can. There's kind of a disconnect in that the CEO, who may be ethical, isn't doing ethical things because he's doing it for the corporation.

Speaker 3: Wait a minute, it's more than that. Because when you're as an industry or a corporation calling and telling journals that they have to retract articles, or you're paying for research and you say, "This is outcome we want, because otherwise we won't fund your department." It's more than that. There's a moral compass that is somewhere lost. There's no true north anymore. I don't know what's going on. It's not just we have to make money, we have to make money at all costs.

Male: Yeah.

Speaker 7: It seems like it's your right to go ask a journal to retract an article, but it's ridiculous that you have enough money to pay a journal that supposedly has integrity that will suddenly just retract an article. The scale is really tipped. As a corporation, you're not supposed to have a moral compass necessarily. That's not in your charge. While I wish corporations had moral compasses, I don't think it's up to them. I think it's up to everybody else to maintain integrity and reduce the size and power of corporations.

Speaker 5: Maybe put some, reign them in. Unfortunately our government's not doing their job.

Speaker 7: They're a government regulated entity. That ought to be stronger. I don't think ...

Speaker 5: Our government is agencies that are supposed to be regulating the industries, aren't doing it. That's not just the chemical. It's banking, it's everything. It's like corporations have been able to go in and buy our government officials and pretty much get away with whatever they want, and write the regulations. Look at Alec, they're basically a bill writing mill basically. They write this stuff and then they slide it through. This is what we get.

Speaker 3: You brought up that, it was the Grocers Association.

Speaker 5: Grocery Manufacturers Association.

Speaker 3: They want to pass a law that would be illegal for a state to pass a labeling law. Think about that for a second.

Speaker 5: They are trying to undermine it. They're undermining our state's ability ...

Speaker 3: Undermining is putting it mildly. If you even, it's like how can they even come up with this and how do our legislators who supposedly work for us even listen to that?

Speaker 5: They don't work for us. That's the thing.

Speaker 3: I said supposedly.

Speaker 5: They don't work for us. They work for where the money comes from. The money comes from the corporations and people that have a lot of money.

Male: We've got a broke system all around.

Speaker 5: It's a completely dysfunctional system where we don't have control, the people don't have control anymore. The corporations do, because they control. Because now you can buy pretty much any politician you want. They have and they will. Both sides. It's not a Democrat issue. They're basically two sides of the same coin. It's up to the people, we're the only ones that can stop them at this point. We're the only one that can stop them. People.

Speaker 3: Tara, it's so great to be in your home.

Tara: Thank you.

Speaker 3: What I'd love to ask you is how you got to the position you're in, and what exactly that you're doing right now in your state. I know that you've made some news, but I want you to tell me exactly what you've been doing.

Tara: Sure. I think it's important that you know what inspired me and how I got here. My story really starts 10 years ago where I had trouble getting pregnant, where I had stomach problems, headaches, wasn't feeling well. Luckily had my three children, but after having my three children, was even sicker. Had tingly fingers, had no idea what was going on with me. At the same time, my son developed allergies to nuts. There were no allergies in my family so I didn't know where that was coming from.

I for myself went to doctors everywhere, because I wanted to feel better. I was all 30 years old. I felt I deserved to feel better. Doctors wanted to put me on all sorts of different drugs. I refused because something deep inside me told me that that was not the right way. There had to be more. I started reading everything I could under the sun and doing research, and realized that I could heal myself through changes in food. It was at that time that I went all organic, got rid of GMOs, changed what we cleaned my house with. I got better.

Speaker 3: That is an amazing story. I'm quite impressed with your intuition.

Tara: Thank you. Experiencing that though made me want to tell the world and share what I had learned. I started sharing it with everyone I possibly could, actually. I ended up getting my certification as a holistic health counselor. I'm also an attorney. I

set the intention to combine my advocacy skills as an attorney with my passion for health and wellness, and work for better food policy in this country. I really felt that the most important issue we were dealing with right now when it comes to food policy is GMOs. In Connecticut, we led the charge to pass the first in the country GMO labeling bill.

Speaker 3: Again, that's an impressive story. A very impressive story. It was the first in the nation?

Tara: Yes, first in the nation.

Speaker 3: When was that passed?

Tara: In June of 2013.

Speaker 3: This is very recent?

Tara: Very recent.

Speaker 3: How difficult was it to get this achieved?

Tara: If you can imagine, it was like driving a Mack truck down 95 in the middle of rush hour traffic with detours. It was very difficult because we were the people rising up against the most powerful industry in our country. We were up against the chemical industry and we were up against the junk food industry. Taking those two together, they have never ending funding, and access to our politicians.

Speaker 3: How do you think you were able to accomplish this? Why could you accomplish this, and it has not been accomplished in other places like California where we know there was an attempt?

Tara: Right. We certainly hope to help other states now use the model that we did in Connecticut. What it really comes down to is getting the people to become loud enough and to get that political power so that the politicians have to listen to their constituents. It really is all about the people rising up. We got loud enough in Connecticut and big enough that we scared them. We were able to push back against those powerful interests.

Speaker 3: Was this something that had to be voted on? How does it work in Connecticut?

Tara: Yeah, it wasn't a ballot initiative. We had to go through the legislature so that there was a bill. The bill would require GMO labeling. At the end of the session, the legislators vote on it. We just needed to convince enough legislators, there are 200 in Connecticut. In the end, only three legislators in the entire state voted against us. That was how much people power we had going.

Speaker 3: Again, whatever this recipe was, it's an amazing story because it's an unusual story, as you know.

Tara: Yes. I hope going forward though that the legacy of what happened in Connecticut will show people that if you use your voice and you stand up, that democracy actually still can work. We can force our government to work for us, rather than the special interests that are funding their campaigns. That's what I hope our legacy can be.

Speaker 3: What was the main argument or the main arguments against passing your initiative that you heard? Either from the legislators or from the industry?

Tara: Sure. They're quite laughable. The number one argument from the industry was that labeling will confuse consumers. We find that laughable and condescending because more information can only take away the confusion. Right now people are confused. People want to make the right decisions. If they don't have the information to make the right decisions for themselves, if they don't have the choice to make those decisions for themselves because they don't have that information, then it's not confusing.

Speaker 3: Was that an argument given to you by a legislator, or was that from the industry?

Tara: The legislators were spitting back the industry arguments. Those who were opposed to labeling were being fed it from the Farm Bureau, who really receives money from Monsanto and the chemical industry, from the chemical industry and from the Grocery Manufacturers Association who's some of our biggest opposition. That we also are very confused by, because supermarkets are supported by the consumer. Yet they are fighting against something that the consumer wants. I will not shop in any of those supermarkets anymore. We actually did some demonstrations in front of supermarkets that were part of the Grocery Manufacturers Association. There was another Association

called the Connecticut Food Association. We were able to force Whole Foods to remove themselves from that association.

Speaker 3: Wow. That's amazing again. That's specific to Connecticut, right?

Tara: Yes.

Speaker 3: In other states it's very different. These associations all have a lot of power in probably every state.

Tara: They do, they have a lot of power. There were of course other arguments. Another argument was that it's like putting a skull and crossbones on the labels to make us think that GMOs are bad. It's not. It's just simply giving people information. Because we are smart enough to make decisions for ourselves. We can read arguments on both sides, whether GMOs are safe or not. That should be our choice. They can't force it down our throats like they have been.

Speaker 3: Why do you think the supermarkets don't want to sell GMO free food? Is there less markup? Is this just purely a financial issue for them that there's less markup on the GMO free foods?

Tara: Eventually I think that they're just going to have to come on our side, because we can't understand why the supermarkets are so against it. What a lot of the supermarkets would tell us is, we're not opposed to labeling, we're just supposed to it happening at a state level. They wanted it to be at the federal level. The problem is, and that's just an argument.

Speaker 3: It's just an argument you hear about everything.

Tara: Exactly. We'd love to see them argue for it at the federal level.

Speaker 3: Then whatever else is inconvenient at the federal level, they'd rather see it at the state level. This is an argument you hear in both sides of the mouth.

Tara: Exactly. It's absurd. It's just totally absurd. We can't understand why the supermarkets are against it, because it's really no skin off their back. They should want to provide the consumer with the information that the consumer wants.

Speaker 3: So you don't know if there's pressure? There must be ...

Tara: I'm sure there's pressure.

Speaker 3: I'm wondering about the political pressure, the financial pressures that maybe the large chemical industry consortium puts on these affiliations.

Tara: Sure, absolutely. I mean, they're all speaking and they're all conspiring together to create the same arguments because they're all making the same arguments. We know that they're working together. In fact, we were able to tell who was speaking with who. Because when our legislators or our governor would spit back the same arguments that we were hearing from the opposition, we knew that they were in communication with each other.

Speaker 3: Did they present any so-called independent scientists or researchers to come and speak against your initiative?

Tara: They did. At our hearing, they had a scientist from the chemical industry come and speak. Our legislators at the hearing were so on our side that they actually mocked him. One of my favorite comments the entire session was when he said that you can't have a label because it will be like a warning label. One of the legislators looked at him and said, "How would it be then if we had a label that said improved by genetic engineering?" Everybody laughed.

They did provide the scientist, but for whatever reason our legislators that were against us weren't moved by the chemical industry so much as by the farm bureau. The chemical industry has done a fantastic job staying more in the background and putting organizations like the Farm Bureau in front. Like the Grocery Manufacturers Association in front. Because supermarkets are much more sympathetic to our legislators. Farmers are much more sympathetic to our legislators than the chemical industry. Our legislators don't really care about the chemical industry. They care about the farmer. They care about the businesses our state. They were very smart.

Speaker 3: They care about the individual votes, too?

Tara: Yes, that's what ultimately won out. The individual votes, the people ultimately won out.

Speaker 3: Interesting. The other thing I'm really curious about, and I know you talked about feeling bad. How soon after you eliminated what you would call GMO and the nonorganic or the pesticide sprayed produce and whatever else you were eliminating, how soon after you were eliminating all those things did you see a difference in the way you felt?

Tara: I saw a big difference quickly in my energy level. I should also add that when I got rid of the bad stuff, I added more good stuff in. I started drinking green juice. I started eating raw food. Within just a few months, my energy level skyrocketed, and the symptoms dissipated pretty quickly within months.

Speaker 3: Did you see a change in your children's health?

Tara: My children rarely go to the doctor. I hate to say that, knock on wood. When they get a cold, it's a quick cold. They rarely end up at the doctor. My son's allergies actually when they tested them recently, the doctor said that there's proof that he's growing out of it. I hope that I'm building his immune system in a way that it will level out and he won't be severely allergic anymore.

Speaker 3: Have you been in touch with some of the researchers, independent researchers who have been looking at the adverse effects of GMO?

Tara: Yes. We've spoken with some of them because we brought them here to testify. I've been very fortunate to get to know Michael Hansen from Consumers Union and John Fagan who wrote a paper called truths and myths of GMOs, and they are incredible. They are brilliant. They are every bit legitimate as the scientist working, actually, they're more legitimate than the scientists who are working for Monsanto being paid by Monsanto to do the funding for the chemical industry.

Speaker 3: Then finally, in your initiatives, did you find or did you discover any backdoor tricks that the industry was doing? Was there anything in terms of outright bribing? I don't even know. Did anything come up that seemed that it was out of the realm of being completely ethical or even legal?

Tara: I mean, I wish I had proof of that. In Connecticut we actually have fairly strict campaign finance rules. It would be very tough for the chemical industry to give money up front. I have no idea what happened behind closed doors. I do know that the governor and

the speaker of the house were very much in line with what the opposition was saying.

When it came down to the final negotiations to get a bill, the Senate leadership, both Democrat and Republican, were the voice of the people. They were fighting for us in the negotiations and the governor's office and the speaker of the house were really fighting for the opposition. Those were the sides. As they were negotiating, the Senate Democrats and Republicans would call me to say, "Is this okay as we're negotiating?" The other side, the governor's office and the speaker of the house were going to the Grocery Manufacturers Association, the chemical companies and the Farm Bureau to find out what they could live with.

Speaker 3: I'm wondering if it was anyway the governor's last term. Certainly it sounds like it's going to be the governor's last term.

Tara: He's not well-liked in Connecticut.

Speaker 3: I can imagine. He picked the wrong side.

Tara: He definitely pick the wrong side. I'm saying this knowing that it could get me in trouble.

Speaker 3: Oh, no, but I think it's obvious to hear. The history show, he picked the wrong side.

Tara: Yes. In the end, the governor doesn't want people to know that he was in opposition. He never said he was opposed to GMO labeling. He was opposing it in a way that made it seem like he was on our side. We could never actually say the governor was against GMO labeling, but the governor first wanted a trigger clause of 15 to 20 other states needing to pass before Connecticut's law would go into effect. We still do have a trigger clause. Ultimately, the compromise was that there was a trigger clause where four other states with an aggregate population of 20 million within the Northeast needs to pass a bill before ours will go into effect.

So yes, so that was the compromise. We got the bill passed, but now we're working with other states to get it passed. I have no doubt, and I want to make that really clear. I have no doubt that other states are going to pass. They are going to pass bills, because they can do what we did. We opened the door. Now the door is open and other states will pass. Our bill will trigger. The governor

supports it, but with a big trigger clause. He didn't want to be the only state to do this.

Speaker 3: Do the other states that you're working with function on initiatives the way Connecticut does? Meaning is it like California where the people have to vote, and then they can be confused, which is what happened.

Tara: No. The other states, it's also legislatively. I think in many ways, our movement made a little bit of mistake by not investing in the legislative states upfront. All the money has gone to the ballot initiatives. I have core support the ballot initiatives. I pray for the ballot initiatives. Washington state is voting on their ballot initiative next week on election day. But this is not just about our food. This is about taking back our government. We need take back the legislative process. By not investing in these states that have legislators to get these bills passed, I think we missed a really great opportunity that we could have seized sooner. Here we are in 2013, the end of 2013. States are introducing bills left and right, but with no funding. We had very little funding in Connecticut.

Speaker 3: The funding for the opposition is so great that it's easy with a PR spin to defeat ...

Tara: Sure, absolutely. Again, Connecticut was just the people rising up and getting loud enough. You can imagine if you just put a little funding into our side to hire a lobbyist, to pay for some social media, to pay for a little PR to get more media attention, these legislative states would explode. That's what we hope to do now with the organization citizens for GMO labeling that we set up. Support the grassroots and just buoy them a little bit. Because we can pass laws like this.

Speaker 3: How did you get so many people to one, pay attention to what you're saying, and two, understand what you were saying? How did you do that? How did you accomplish that?

Tara: Education was a big piece of what we're doing, because we really believe there's an awakening happening in our country right now. We saw part of our role not just getting the bill passed, but waking more people up. Educating to them what was going on with their food supply. We just set out to get into every library in the state and show films, documentary films on what was happening with our food supply, and educational talks. We had this team of 25

people working across the state that we're doing educational talks, going to where the people were, setting up tables at events. We just educated people.

Once people woke up to this and learned about it, they couldn't help but become active participants. Our message was very much, this is what you now know. What are you going to do with it? You need to call your legislator. They need to hear from you. We had people turn up at our rallies and at our hearing dates. We've really harnessed social media. We had an amazing social media volunteer. Our Facebook page exploded and our Twitter account exploded. Social media is huge today, because you can so many more people than you could without it.

Speaker 3: I don't know if this is happening in the industry with the GMO world, but I know that in some other cases where people are looking and talking about like the safety issues around vaccines that, the CDC is, they have IT people who are actually looking for people mentioning adverse events in vaccines together on social media and following these groups. So is the industry. I'm wondering if you know of any counter social media events happening with the food industry and the chemical industry.

Tara: Yes, no, I am. Most recently I think they realized they were behind us. We're winning on the social media front. I think they realized they were behind us. They just recently launched a new website to answer questions about GMOs and are on social media a lot more. They're trying to find people, farmers who are people, mother farmers to get out there and speak about GMOs in a positive light. They definitely have launched a campaign. They're very upfront about launching a new PR campaign on social media to combat everything that we've been doing.

Speaker 3: What is their positive spin? What can you say that's great about GMOs?

Tara: Anything I can say that they say is great about GMOs is simply propaganda and lies. It's typical. They say that we need GMOs to feed a hungry world, which is complete bogus. Because if you look at the Rodale Institute that's been doing field studies for 30 years, it actually shows that organic outgrows conventional NGMOs. We don't need GMOs to feed in the world, not to mention that the GMOs are not even feeding the countries that are starving.

Speaker 3: They're mostly feeding us and Canada, right?

Tara: Exactly. GMOs are feeding overfed, undernourished Americans, end of story.

Speaker 3: And Canadians.

Tara: And Canadians. We don't need GMOs to feed a hungry world. They now have recently launched this golden rice idea that children ...

Speaker 3: It was launched a while ago.

Tara: It was launched a while, but you see it's resurfaced because they need that for their PR. They need to try to prove that there's a reason that we need GMOs. Because we're going to be able to give children rice to combat vitamin deficiency. Again, it's just a front for the fact that GMOs were created to boost sales of chemicals. End of story

Speaker 3: And possibly ...

Tara: And Control our food supply.

Speaker 3: And control of food supply, thank you. I was going to say, possibly also to control the food supply, I think.

Tara: Those two big things. Sell more chemicals, and control our food supply. Right now we think that GMOs are so big. The problem is that right now, it's actually a small number of our crops that are GMO, they were brilliant about it because they went right for the commodity crops.

Speaker 3: Corn and soy, canola.

Tara: Corn and soy, canola, sugar beets which makes most of the sugar in America, and cotton for cottonseed oil and the cotton that's grown over in India. They're rejecting it now. There are hundreds of GMOs waiting to be introduced.

Speaker 3: In the pipeline, of course.

Tara: So that eventually our broccoli, our salad, our trees, they want to patent everything so that they control the entire food supply. The frightening thing is that they say two things. They talk out of two sides of the mouth. GMOs are no different so they don't need to be

tested and they can be designated as generally recognized as safe by the FDA. Yet they're so different that we need a patent on it. They like to have it both ways.

Speaker 3: That's not so unusual, is it?

Tara: No. We really try because the other thing the other side does is they try to say, we've been genetically modifying food for thousands of years. We have to actually in our messaging be very careful to separate out what's been happening for the last 20 years where we have these genetically engineered foods being created in a science lab and could never happen in nature, versus hybrid and modification could happen in nature.

Speaker 3: Or even just recessive traits that have been naturally, like nectarines, which are often used as the talking point on why we've been doing GMO foods for thousands of years, which makes zero sense.

Tara: Right, and people talk about pluots. It's very different.

Speaker 3: It's very different.

Tara: Very different.

Speaker 3: I understand you felt better when you eliminated these toxins in your environments, which included going organic. Obviously going organic means eliminating GMOs from your food chain. When did you decide, oh, I feel better. I'm now going to be an activist and devote all my time and effort and energy this cause? How did that switch come about?

Tara: I think it was probably a slow progression. I started just by talking to my family and talking to my friends. Slowly but surely, that grew. The people I was speaking to grew. The way that I really became an activist was because I had developed a relationship with my legislator speaking about these things to him so that when the bill came up, he knew to tell me to come testify. It was standing in line waiting to testify, meeting other people that were there to testify with me that I realized, okay, this is the time. We all need to get together. It wasn't just me.

The group that I work with calls me the spark plug, that I got it started. There are so many people doing this work. I think the spark really happened when I went that first time to testify, which

was in 2012 where I realized that we all have to take personal responsibility and work to make change. You can't wait for Superman. You can't think someone else is going to do it better than you. You have to know that the power's in your hands, and you can be the one to make the change. When you meet other people that are willing to take that responsibility, it's that combination of energy that just starts to build and build, and then makes difference.

Speaker 3: You're telling me you started this only a year before you accomplished what you set out to start? Is that what you said? You first testified in 2012 and this initiative passed in June of 2013?

Tara: Yes.

Speaker 3: Okay, so that's even more amazing. I assumed you've been fighting this for a few years.

Tara: So backtrack, I have been doing GMO education for a couple of years because I wanted to share my knowledge. The actual legislative action started in 2012 when there was a first hearing and everyone started to connect and we all started to meet each other.

Speaker 3: You did this in one year?

Tara: Really a year and a half.

Speaker 3: Okay, that's amazing. You have to know that that is unprecedented.

Tara: I'll tell you everyone told us to buckle up for the long haul. I always tell people, believe in the impossible. Because even in 2012 people told us, it will never happen this first year. We discarded that and we acted and worked. It could happen tomorrow. We just really worked our hearts out. It was 24/7. Our families suffer for it a little bit, but we were doing it for our families. We were able to justify that. We just worked around the clock for 18 months. We just believed in the impossible and went for it.

Speaker 3: How did it feel when it passed? Were you guys shocked? Were you surprised? What did that feel like?

Tara: Slightly bittersweet because of the trigger clause. We didn't want a trigger clause. It meant that it wasn't going to be going into effect immediately. It meant that our work isn't done. Our work is not

done until the law goes into effect. It certainly felt amazing. We really had worked very hard. It was a great day. I'll tell you again, you go with your intuition, the day the bill passed, we didn't really know that it was going to happen. We didn't necessarily know the bill was going to pass when it did the way it did. We kind of knew in our hearts that it was going to. We invited the leaders from the other states that were part of the trigger clause to come and be with us.

We put out an action alert to other people, please come be with us. This is because of you. We want you to celebrate with us. We told the press conference for later in that day assuming and hoping that it would pass. It was one of those moments where you just know that the universe is conspiring with you, because it all fell place. We had invited the governor to come. He came.

Speaker 3: Did he act ...

Tara: He actually said, "You all may not have seen this coming, but I saw it coming."

Speaker 3: Wow.

Tara: He probably did. He saw it because he knew. The phone calls weren't stopping in his office. They needed the phone calls in his office to stop. The only way they were going to stop was if a bill passed. The question only became, was it a bill that all sides could live with? The unfortunate reality is that democracy takes compromise. We needed to compromise a little bit. That was the trigger clause. Again, we have no doubt that our friends, I call them fellow GMO labeling warriors. We have no doubt that they're going to pass bills as well.

Speaker 3: You are a force to be reckoned with. That's for sure.

Tara: Again, it wasn't me. We really had a huge team of people. I might just be that spark plug, but it takes a lot more of a spark plug to make an engine go.

Speaker 3: Yeah. You know, spark plugs are really important.

Tara: Thank you.

Speaker 3: Thank you.

Patrick G.: I hope you really enjoyed this bonus episode of GMOs revealed. Again, thanks so much for supporting us, supporting this vision. GMOs revealed really cares a lot about you. We care about the planet, we care about the future of humanity. Together, we're making a difference.