

The Corporation  
4<sup>th</sup> in a series  
© 2010  
by Michael Keehn  
mhkeehn@gmail.com

In the last column we left off examining personality traits of a corporation in analyzing their character. Thus far we have examined: 1) “Callous unconcern for the feelings of others” and checked the YES box; 2) “Incapacity to maintain enduring relationships” and checked the YES box; 3) “Reckless disregard for the safety of others” and checked the YES box. Next trait...

**Deceitfulness: Repeated lying and conning of others for profit or some illusive benefit.**

YES [ ] NO [ ]

In a box of Monsanto Documents related to testing cows being treated with rbst, (the Monsanto growth hormone), it was revealed that Monsanto had lied through its teeth to the public as well as the *United States Food & Drug administration* whom gave this product their blessing.

The files revealed that cows often had areas of chronic inflammation in the heart, lungs, kidneys & spleen, and when you drink milk from cows treated with this hormone, you too are getting a small dose. There were also reproductive effects, as well as a series of other problems. It was found that rbst results in un-necessary pain, suffering and distress of the cows. Most of us with any sense of morality would conclude that this is not acceptable side effects for a drug designed to increase milk production.

The rbst drug was found to cause mastitis, which is a bacterial infection of the cows udder. If a cow with a mastitis infection is milked, the puss from the infection ends up in the milk, although the infectious bacteria will most likely be killed by pasteurization and become inert puss in the milk. As the cows become sick from the rbst treatment, they are then treated with antibiotics which also show up in the milk.

The medical and scientific community is fully aware that the people who drink this milk are receiving antibiotics in this food product and that this is contributing to the evolution of *antibiotic resistant bacteria and diseases*. We know we're in trouble when people go into a hospital with a *staff infection* who cannot be cured with antibiotics and die.

Bad for the cow, bad for the farmer, and bad for the consumer. From the perspective of the consumer, why should they take any risk?

This drug has received such unfavorable public scrutiny that most milk suppliers now make note on their milk cartons that the milk does not come from cows treated with rbst, CRYSTAL dairy products for one. Other suppliers of milk make a statement on their cartons to the effect that '*studies show there is no discernable difference between milk from cows treated with rbst and cows not so treated.*'

In the end corporations will respond to our purchasing power. If we don't buy the milk with rbst,

then corporations will not supply such milk. It is possible that corporations may make decisions not to supply milk from cows treated with rbst because the Board of Directors and/or management have a moral sense against doing so, but it is highly unlikely. It is more likely the corporation is making such a decision because of our purchasing practice. Even so, CRYSTAL DAIRY should be recognized and thanked for the fact that none of their dairy products come from cows treated with rbst.

Therefore, under the trait, “**Deceitfulness: Repeated lying and conning of others for profit or some illusive benefit**” YES  NO  , the corporation receives a check in the YES box. Next trait...

**Inability to experience guilt:** YES  NO

But the toxic contamination of Monsanto’s rbst hormone is not the end of their story. In Vietnam, the *enemy* (that is the people trying to rid themselves of a foreign invader – about the same as is going on Iraq currently) were able to hide from our military in the jungles. What was needed was to defoliate thousands and thousands and thousands of acres of jungle. This is about as environmentally friendly as defoliating thousands and thousands of acres of the Redwood Forests on the coast of California.

In defoliating the jungle, our military sprayed large areas of Vietnam with Monsanto’s *Agent Orange*. To date the Vietnamese Ministry of Foreign Affairs reports that 4.8 million Vietnamese were exposed to Agent Orange, and because of that exposure, there have been 400,000 deaths, 500,000 birth defects and 100,000 cancers in Vietnamese civilians.

Our own military personnel who were exposed have suffered birth defects in their children and cancers as well. Unlike the Vietnamese, United States veterans were able to sue Monsanto for causing their illness. Monsanto settled out of court, paying \$80,000,000 (80 million) in damages, which is probably just a drop in the bucket to the amount made in selling the chemical to the military, and no guilt was admitted.

But the saga of Monsanto does not end there. In India, Monsanto used western marketing techniques to sell their genetically modified bt-cotton seed to the government and farmers of that country. The farmers were promised higher yields and a cotton that would not need pesticides. While the product labels did say that best results would be obtained with irrigated land, the farmers were not told that this genetically altered variety of cotton would not do as well as legacy seed cotton created by mother nature in the dryer areas. The farmers borrowed money to buy the bt-cotton seed, then borrowed more money for the pesticides they were told they would not need. The result in 2006 has been the suicide of 125,000 farmers in India who were unable to pay their bills and were losing their land.

While we have placed Monsanto under the microscope here, many corporations exhibit the same calloused behavior. Therefore, under the character trait: “**Inability to experience guilt:**” YES  NO  , we check the YES box. More to come so stay tuned.