

Achim Steiner
 Director
 Oxford Martin School
 Oxford OX1 3D

Dear Achim Steiner

In your position as former UNEP Director-General I copied you into a document that I sent to the US EPA: **Grave Inaccuracies and Omissions in US EPA Glyphosate Issue Paper: Evaluation of Carcinogenic Potential**. However, I understand that you have just moved from UNEP, to be Director of the Oxford Martin School. In fact, I believe it is particularly apposite for you to share this document with all your colleagues in the Oxford Martin Commission and School.

May I remind you of the introduction to the UNEP Report on Global Bee Colony Disorders and Other Threats to Insect Pollinators¹ that you launched in March 2011: *“Current evidence demonstrates that a sixth major extinction of biodiversity event is underway. The earth is losing between 1 and 10% of its biodiversity per decade, mostly due to habitat loss, pest invasion, pollution, over-harvesting and disease. Certain natural ecosystem services are vital for human society.”* In 3.2 it mentions both chemical spray drift from agricultural spraying and systemic neonicotinoid insecticides.

You probably won't recall that I wrote to you at UNEP in 2011 about the systemic neonicotinoid insecticides. I quoted to you several papers showing that they acted on mammalian nicotinic acetylcholine receptors, including this paper: Tomizawa, M., Lee, D.L., Casida, J.E. Neonicotinoid insecticides: Molecular Features Conferring Selectivity for Insect versus Mammalian Nicotinic Receptors. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **48** (12), 6016-6024 (2000). *These authors showed that neonicotinoids acted on mammalian nicotinic acetylcholine receptors as well, but considered that the selective nature of its binding (i.e. less affinity than in insects) made it safe for human exposure.* I believe I said that with the amount of neonicotinoid insecticides that were applied to seeds or were being sprayed on crops meant that humans must be affected. You referred me to Dr Peter Gilruth former Director of UNEP's Division of Early Warning and Assessment (who dealt with human health). He replied with a somewhat enigmatic letter and then stopped responding.

In late 2011 the SETAC Pellston Pollinator Conference was for 'invited guests' only. The Executive Summary was by David Fischer Bayer CropScience and Tom Moriarty US EPA In the same year, 2011, the US EPA held a conference on pollinators.² Three crucial admissions were made that had not been made before, either by industry or by the US EPA.

1. That the systemic neonicotinoid pesticides are harmful to bees.
2. That the tests and protocols that had allowed registration of the systemic pesticides were not adapted to assess potential hazard and risk from this type of pesticide.
3. Despite knowing all this, the Protection Agencies have allowed the pesticides industry to keep the neonicotinoids on the market.

¹

http://www.unep.org/dewa/Portals/67/pdf/Global_Bee_Colony_Disorder_and_Threats_insect_pollinators.pdf

² <http://www.moraybeedinosaurs.co.uk/neonicotinoid/pesticide%20risk%20assessment.pdf>

The systemic neonicotinoid insecticides are still on the market, apart from those on flowering crops attractive to bees that were banned by EFSA in 2013. New ones are being authorised by the European Commission e.g. Sulfoxaflor

However, according to the Coalition Against Bayer Dangers (CBG) **EU must revoke license for Neonicotinoids**. The sales of neonicotinoids are still the same as before.³ The measures have not led to a reduction in neonicotinoid demand. A list published by the German government upon a request by the Green party shows that the quantities used after the ban stayed at the same level (see below). The quantities exported by German companies even increased significantly – from 952 tons (2008) to 2269 tons (2014).

UK Advisory Committee on Pesticides changed to Expert Committee on Pesticides

British farmers have been even trying to get derogations for oil seed rape. Defra officials changed the Advisory Committee of Pesticides to the Expert Committee on Pesticides; this meant that at the May 2016 meeting Bayer and Syngenta attended to provide input to the NFU's request to discuss the "emergency lifting of the EU moratorium on systemic neonicotinoid insecticides for oil seed rape." There was a delay on publication of these minutes.⁴ The ECP was gagged by Defra who told the committee it wanted to prevent campaigners lobbying ministers on the issue. The meeting record was only published after a second NFU application, to suspend the **neonicotinoid ban for only 5% of oil seed rape fields, was successful**. Industry representatives explained to the ECP meeting *"that 79% of the oilseed rape crop was under threat or severe risk from cabbage stem flea beetle and aphids. They explained that failure to control these pests could result in significant impacts on yields. For example a significant presence of Turnip Yellow Virus could reduce yields by 6-12%. 'High levels' of infestation were being reported. They also outlined how the difficulty of bringing new products to the EU market meant it was unlikely that alternative pesticides would be available."*

Italy's partial ban on systemic neonicotinoid insecticides in 2008 had been successful

At a Beekeeping Conference held in Guelph University, Ontario on 12 August 2015,⁵ Prof Franco Mutinelli said Italy instituted a partial ban on neonicotinoids in 2008 and it has been extended each year since. No active substances are allowed in seed coatings and the use of neonicotinoids is restricted to specific cases. *"It's been effective"*, he said. *"After the ban there has been strong improvement. The effect of the ban was immediate."* He said corn producers were worried about losing crop yield to disease, *"but that didn't happen,"* he said. *"The ban has been now seven years and crop yield is within the expected range."* Christian Krupke's (University of Purdue) research indicates that the benefit of neonicotinoid treatment to corn seeds only lasts two weeks. Then it washes away with the water and seeps into the soil. Further, he said the pests the neonicotinoids are supposed to fend off are not present in the majority of farms. But they are really toxic to honey bees, he said. *"The benefit of the seed treatments is hard to justify,"* he said. *"We know the status quo just doesn't work."*

Pan-European epidemiological study on honeybee colony losses EPILOBEE 2012-2014⁶

The objective of the two-year programme was to get a state of play of honeybee colony losses on a harmonised basis in each of the participating Member States. This landmark

³ <http://www.cbgnetwork.org/6458.html>

⁴ <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/jul/29/bee-harming-pesticide-firms-took-part-key-meeting-ban>

⁵ <http://www.guelphmercury.com/news-story/5795639-italy-s-ban-on-neonicotinoids-effective-u-of-g-conference-told/>

⁶ http://ec.europa.eu/food/animals/live_animals/bees/study_on_mortality/index_en.htm

study revealed the UK was suffering one of the worst rates of honeybee colony deaths in Europe.⁷ In the cold winter of 2012-13, **29%** of honeybee colonies in the UK died, with only Belgium suffering a higher rate of losses (34%) of the 17 countries surveyed. By contrast, only **5%** of colonies in Italy were lost.

Bayer and Syngenta concealing unpublished field trials with the US EPA

22/09/2016, under FOI, Greenpeace found that unpublished field trials on neonicotinoid insecticides showing Syngenta's thiamethoxam and Bayer's clothianidin caused serious harm to honeybees at high levels.⁸

Yet in August 2016, Syngenta had told Greenpeace that: *"none of the studies Syngenta has undertaken or commissioned for use by regulatory agencies have shown damages to the health of bee colonies"*. Prof Dave Goulson, a UK bumblebee researcher at the University of Sussex, said: *"That clearly contradicts their own study"*. Goulson & Nicholls have just published a paper: The canary in the coalmine; bee declines as an indicator of environmental health.⁹ *"We argue that bee declines are indicators of pervasive and ongoing environmental damage that is likely to impact broadly on biodiversity and the ecosystem services it provides."*

Industry pays about 60% of UK Chemicals Regulation Directorate budget

The exact amount each year is based on a formula enshrined in the recent European Legislation on Plant Protection Products; it depends on work done. The loyalty of the staff must lie with the industry that pays them, rather than the protection of Human Health and the Environment. Is it a safety agency or a service agency? This is illustrated by the following: Extracts from the CRD Annual Report 2008/2009: *"This has been a very busy year in the approvals group. Applications for product approvals were 9% over business estimates with a total of 1,767 applications received and 1,622 applications completed this year, 96% of which were completed within published targets. Importantly 100% of 'fast track' applications identified by industry as high priority to their business needs were completed within published targets. Achieving this demanding target despite the increase in applications has required diligent application and commitment of evaluating staff and their managers and represents a significant achievement. We continue to support growers and we have completed the first stage of the conversion exercise for the 'Long Term Arrangements for Extension of Use' on non-edible crops. Of the 401 uses requested by growers, the 131 products containing active substances that have already been fully reviewed in the EU review programme, and included on Annex I of Council Directive 91/414/EEC have been completed. The remaining product/uses identified by growers will be automatically included in the on-going re-registration process minimising the impact on industry. We also assisted in the evaluation of new products by helping companies work towards the completion of appropriate dossiers through the provision of detailed advice. This advice has covered both chemical pesticides and biopesticides that we continue to support under our biopesticides scheme. We submitted completed evaluation reports for 5 new active substances where the*

⁷ <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/apr/07/britain-honey-bee-colony-deaths-worst-europe-study>

⁸ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/sep/22/pesticide-manufacturers-own-tests-reveal-serious-harm-to-honeybees>

⁹

<http://stl.publisher.ingentaconnect.com/search/expand?pub=infobike://stl/sciprg/2016/00000099/0000003/art00005&token=00911da27f68d719aa836332b25357e663f522f513050555f5c27203440714c6d267e57275c277b425731465d767834772c557660592f3f3b386a3340252b614445232b602a412590>

UK was the EU Rapporteur Member State and issued 3 UK provisional authorisations in advance of Annex I inclusion. In addition we completed 8 'partial dossier' submissions.

UK Food and Environment Research Agency (FERA) survey of pesticides 1988 to 2014

This review of pesticides active substances and number of times treated from 1988 to 2014 confirms that Pesticide Residues on British food are increasing annually. A survey of pesticide (active substances) usage on Oil Seed Rape (OSR) 1988-2014 showed that the number of active substances applied had increased from 5 in 1988 to 15 in 2014 (Fig 1) and the number of treatments had increased from 5 in 1988 to 12 in 2014. (Fig 2) In 2014, herbicides were used on 98.4% OSR and seed treatments on 95.8%.




Fig. 1 PESTICIDES: Number of active substances used on Oil Seed Rape in the UK between 1988 and 2014: By kind permission of John Hoar, Hampshire Beekeeper's Spray Liaison Officer. Figures supplied by FERA




Fig. 2 PESTICIDES TIMES TREATED: used on Oil Seed Rape in the UK between 1988 and 2014: By kind permission of John Hoar, Hampshire Beekeepers Spray Liaison Officer. Figures supplied by FERA

Negative impact of neonicotinoid use on wild bee populations in England: 18 year study¹⁰

"We relate 18 years of UK national wild bee distribution data for 62 species to amounts of neonicotinoid use in oilseed rape. We find evidence of increased population extinction rates in response to neonicotinoid seed treatment use on oilseed rape."

The UK State of Nature Report 2016: biodiversity has crashed¹¹

Mark Eaton of the RSPB, the Report's first author said: *"The report includes a new 'biodiversity intactness index', which analyses the loss of species over centuries. The UK has lost significantly more nature over the long term than the global average with the UK the 29th lowest out of 218 countries. It is quite shocking where we stand compared to the rest of the world, even compared to other western European countries: France and Germany are quite a way above us in the rankings,"* said Eaton. *"The index gives an idea of where we have got to over the centuries, and we are pretty knackered."*

It was therefore astounding to hear the complete denial of the NFU and Defra about The State of Nature Report 2016. NFU vice-president Guy Smith said *"intensification of farming had ended in the early 1990s,"* that farmers *"were using less fertiliser and pesticides than ever"* and a spokeswoman from Defra said: *"Protecting our previous environment and supporting our world-leading farmers, a cornerstone of our economy, will form an important part of our EU exit negotiations."* The statistics for pesticide usage produced by the Food and Environment Research Agency (Fera) show exactly the opposite.

Fera became a joint venture between Defra and Capita on 01/04/2015

Why isn't Fera giving feedback to farmers and Defra? Isn't Defra supposed to be advising the UK Government? Have the pesticides usage figures become commercial, confidential data, just as the Agrochemical Companies research is?

What is the Oxford Martin Commission for Future Generations?

The [Oxford Martin Commission for Future Generations](#) gathered 19 international leaders from government, business and civil society to address the growing short-term preoccupations of modern politics and business and identify ways of overcoming today's gridlock in key international negotiations. These include Lord Chris Patten, Arianna Huffington, Lionel Barber from the British media.

"A diverse group of highly respected global leaders has called for a radical shake-up in politics and business to deliver progress on climate change, reduce economic inequality, improve corporate practices and address the chronic burden of disease." The global burden of disease has greatly increased since 2005, but somehow this worthy aim has been dropped from the agenda. In the 2013 Report of the OMC [Now for the Long Term](#) compiled by Pascal Lamy, former Director General of the World Trade Organisation, 63% chronic diseases were mostly attributed to lifestyle choices and there was no mention of pesticides.¹²

Some individuals with the OMC have a declared allegiance to global corporations

The Chairman of the Oxford Martin Commission is [Pascal Lamy](#), Former Director-General of the World Trade Organization. In a case brought by the US, Canada, and Argentina in 2006, the World Trade Organization (WTO) ruled that the European moratorium on GM crops was illegal.

¹⁰ <http://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms12459>

¹¹ http://www.rspb.org.uk/Images/State%20of%20Nature%20UK%20report_%2020%20Sept_tcm9-424984.pdf

¹²

http://www.oxfordmartin.ox.ac.uk/downloads/commission/Oxford_Martin_Now_for_the_Long_Term.pdf

Sir John Beddington is Professor of Natural Resources Management for the OMC. He worked in Defra just before the British Government closed down the wildlife research stations in 2006. He was made Chief Scientific Adviser to the British Government in 2007. In 2012, he declared his faith in GM technology. *"And among those scientific wonders, the use of genetically modified crops has a particularly rich potential"*. Beddington added. *"Just look at the problems that the world faces: water shortages and salination of existing water supplies, for example. GM crops should be able to deal with that."*¹³

John Beddington was one of the first of a group of scientists that called themselves 'population biologists'. In fact, at a meeting in May 2010 in Dundee, some of Sir John's former students celebrated the fact that he had turned 'soft science into hard science'. By this they meant he had led them away from studying organisms in the field to study them theoretically, in a far more comfortable place....in a University in front of a computer. The UK Natural Environment Research Centre (NERC) that closed down the wildlife research centres allegedly 'due to a budget deficit' had given an increase in funding for Dundee's Crops for the Future Programme. (Was it because NERC had been promised a global satellite system GloboLakes to monitor lakes from space? This was opened in 2012. How can one measure biodiversity or pesticides from space?) John Beddington's students also said that he began *'the tradition of strong mathematical ecology in the UK.'* He also encouraged mathematics graduates to enter biology. He felt a biology degree wasn't necessary; just an ability to do statistics and mathematical modelling.

Mathematical modelling failed to predict the declines in Monarch butterflies in the US

In 2012 the Chairman of the EFSA GMO Panel, Professor Joe Perry from Rothamsted Research, was lead author of a paper in the *Journal of Applied Ecology*: "Estimating the effects of Cry1F *Bt*-maize pollen on a non-target Lepidoptera, using a mathematical model of exposure." Conclusion: Mitigation measures of risks of *Bt*-maize to sensitive larvae of non-target lepidopteran species can be effective, but depend on host-plant densities, which are in turn affected by weed-management regimes (sic).

In February 2015 the US Center for Food Safety produced an 88-page Report: Monarchs in peril: Herbicide-Resistant Crops and the decline of Monarch Butterflies in North America.¹⁴ *"Unlike many other weed killers, once absorbed it (glyphosate) is translocated (moved internally) to root tissue, where it kills milkweed at the root and so prevents regeneration. The increasingly common practice of growing Roundup Ready crops continuously on the same fields means that milkweed is exposed to glyphosate every year, with no opportunity to recover. In 1999, common milkweed was found in half of corn and soybean fields, but only 8% of them a decade later."*

Some other Oxford Martin Commissioners

Lionel Barber is Editor of *The Financial Times*. It is a very business-orientated UK paper. According to Colin Macilwain, *"the British press — led by the BBC, which treats the Confederation of British Industry with the deference the Vatican gets in Rome — is overwhelmingly conservative and pro-business in its outlook. It is quite unperturbed by the fact that the UK Science Media Centre's sponsors include AstraZeneca, BP, Coca-Cola, L'Oreal, Monsanto, Syngenta (as well as Nature Publishing Group) but not a single environmental non-governmental organization (NGO) or trade union."*¹⁵

¹³ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2012/oct/13/gm-food-crops-genetic-modification>

¹⁴ http://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/files/cfs-monarch-report_2-4-15_design_05341.pdf

¹⁵ <http://www.nature.com/news/two-nations-divided-by-a-common-purpose-1.10224>

However, in *Seeds of doubt*¹⁶ on July 21 2013, an editorial in *The Financial Times*, (which GM watch reported):¹⁷ *“Europe is right to be cautious over GM crops...Scientists risk getting into an arms race against nature, for which farmers will be forced to pay without receiving any long-term benefit in return.”*

I don't know if Lionel Barber has changed his mind, but the Europe Commission is forging ahead giving lots of GM crops the green light, despite an Open Letter from 60 million US Citizens¹⁸ warning about the hazards of GM crops and glyphosate, which David Cameron, the European Commission and the European Food Safety Authority chose to ignore.

Arianna Huffington President and Editor-in-Chief, Huffington Post Media Group. We have no idea what she thinks about GM Crops.

Lord Chris Patten, Chancellor, University of Oxford, former Chairman of the BBC Trust. We do know what Chris Patten thinks about GM. The BBC is a strong supporter of the agrochemical industry and GM crops. Many people have complained that BBC coverage is completely unbalanced but each time the BBC Complaints Unit dismisses their claims. I wrote to the Director-General of the BBC to ask him why the BBC had allowed the President of Monsanto to deny IARC's claim of carcinogenicity without permitting IARC right of reply. Lord Tony Hall failed to respond. The outrageous Panorama Programme on GM Crops was also condemned.

BBC Panorama: GM Food – Cultivating Fear¹⁹ drew these comments from Lawrence Woodward and Pat Thomas. *Cultivating Myths – The Pro-GMO Bias of the BBC: “The pro-GM bias of the BBC was plain to see during Monday's (8 June 2015) Panorama programme. Blinkered and narrow rather than panoramic, selective and prejudicial rather than investigative, this sorry display set a new low for a programme that was once a flagship of investigative journalism. It had no more veracity and insight than the most clichéd corporate press release and the result was that a mix of myths, deceptive assertions and inaccurate statements by pro-GM lobbyists – including those masquerading as independent scientists – were given a free ride and promotional slot on prime time television. It's tempting to say that you couldn't make this stuff up – except Panorama has proven with its latest fiction that actually you can – and that you can even get the BBC (and thus the licence fee payer) to pay for it.”*²⁰

The many complaints about the Panorama programme were reviewed by the BBC Trust and dismissed outright.²¹ The Trust Editorial Standards Committee (ESC) Richard Ayre, Mark Damazer, Sonita Alleyne, Bill Matthews and Nicholas Prettejohn, actually apologised to Monsanto. *“The programme had achieved due accuracy and due impartiality in the way it reflected the role of Monsanto (an agricultural company). In accurately stating Monsanto's direct interest in the project and in reflecting the reporter's professional judgement that the exercise could sway the public argument over GM, Panorama gave the audience sufficient information to reach an informed view on the issue.”*

Richard Ayre the Chairman of the ESC of the BBC Trust was founder of the UK Food Standards Agency. He had conflicts of interest having previously worked with Monsanto.

The UK could appear in the International Criminal Court for destruction of biodiversity²²

¹⁶ <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/73b3c1dc-f08d-11e2-929c-00144feabdc0.html>

¹⁷ <http://www.gmwatch.org/latest-listing/52-2013/14867-non-gm-demand-rocketing-in-us>

¹⁸ <http://www.theletterfromamerica.org>

¹⁹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6KruFQ2uCgk>

²⁰ <http://beyond-gm.org/cultivating-myths-the-bbc-pro-gmo-bias/>

²¹ http://downloads.bbc.co.uk/bbctrust/assets/files/pdf/appeals/esc_bulletins/2016/feb.pdf

²² <https://www.icc-cpi.int/Pages/item.aspx?name=pr1238>

The International Criminal Court in The Hague announced a change in remit.²³ On 15/09/2016 John Vidal and Owen Bowcott for The Guardian: *“Environmental destruction and land-grabs could lead to governments and individuals being prosecuted for crimes against humanity by the international criminal court following a decision to expand its remit.”* The disgraceful State of Nature 2016 for a start: *“The UK has lost significantly more nature over the long term than the global average with the UK the 29th lowest out of 218 countries. “It is quite shocking where we stand compared to the rest of the world, even compared to other western European countries: France and Germany are quite a way above us in the rankings,” said Eaton. “The index gives an idea of where we have got to over the centuries, and we are pretty knackered.”* The area treated with glyphosate by farmers in the UK has gone from 1,750,000 ha in 2012, to 2,250,000 ha in 2014. But the British Government, EFSA and the European Commission have all voted to re-register glyphosate. In addition, the UK will appear before the European Court of Justice for failing to provide safe habitats for harbour porpoises, the European commission said on 29/09/2016.²⁴ Under EU law, the UK should have drawn up a list of conservation areas for the porpoises, but has so far formally proposed just one small site in the Skerries and Causeway conservation area, in Northern Ireland. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) argues that it is difficult to identify suitable habitats for the porpoises, but this claim by Defra is disputed by conservationists. Ignorance and incompetence by Defra and the NFU are no defences for these crimes against humanity. Successive UK governments have systematically dismantled the statutory wildlife bodies and put the Agrochemical Industry in charge of the environment and human health.

The Year of the Bumblebee – a photo-journal of observations in a small nature reserve

In December 2010, I sent Sir John Beddington, the then Chief Scientific Adviser to the British Government, a copy of our Photo-journal of our small Nature Reserve in South Wales.²⁵ It was written to celebrate the International Year of Biodiversity. Since 2006, we had photographed six species of bumblebee, 20 species of butterfly, four species of bush-cricket, dragonflies, damselflies, grasshoppers, beetles, spiders, ladybirds, hoverflies, solitary bees amongst others. We said it marked our tiny contribution to halting biodiversity loss. Sir John thanked us and said it would make a change to read something different over the weekend. Obviously he only looked at the pictures, not the Postscript: A history of the UK Governments’ responses to the biodiversity crisis. Here is a short extract from it:

“The splitting of the Nature Conservancy Council (NCC)

The NCC had been a thorn in the flesh of politicians in both England and Scotland and undoubtedly Derek Ratcliffe (Chairman of the NCC) was their most outspoken and troublesome Civil Servant. Within days of his retirement in 1989, Margaret Thatcher’s then Environment Minister, Nicolas Ridley, (uncle of Matt Ridley, The Times ‘blogger’ aka 5th Viscount Ridley) set about dismembering the NCC. Scottish politicians were keen on the split; they had greatly resented interference by the English in Fountain Forestry’s project, because it had provided many jobs in an area of low employment.

So, as part of the Environmental Protection Bill 1990, in 1991 the Nature Conservancy Council, the UK body that had originally catalogued and designated important Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and National Nature Reserves (NNRs) for legal protection,

²³ <https://www.theguardian.com/global/2016/sep/15/hague-court-widens-remit-to-include-environmental-destruction-cases>

²⁴ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/sep/29/uk-faces-european-court-for-failing-to-protect-porpoises>

²⁵ <http://www.blurb.com/b/1737995-the-year-of-the-bumblebee>

was split into three separate bodies: English Nature, Scottish Natural Heritage and the Countryside Council for Wales. Statements issued by two Ministers, Lord Hesketh in England and Malcolm Rifkind in Scotland, claimed that they 'wanted to do something for the benefit of conservation'.

However, a leaked confidential report prepared by the Treasury in 1990 indicated that nature conservation was not intended to be a beneficiary: "The proposed reorganisation was an administrative reorganisation not intended to affect conservation effort". It was pointed out that to triplicate posts in England, Wales and Scotland was a profligate waste of public resources. The net additional benefit to conservation would be close to zero.

Thus began the period in which successive UK governments carried out major (and costly) reorganisations of their environmental bodies that would weaken their power and downgrade them, both in importance and in financial terms. They would lose their own independence and be become buried in departments, which, in times of crisis, would leach money from their budgets.

The End of Nature.

For wildlife conservationists, there was one final blow to come. In October 2006 English Nature became Natural England. Thus, over a period of 15 years, despite having signed up to all the UN Biodiversity commitments, a Conservative and a Labour government between them had finally managed to erase from their statutory environmental bodies any mention of unpalatable terms such as 'ecology', 'wildlife', 'conservancy' and 'nature'." Bankers, hedge-fund managers and industrial farmers were then put in charge of the sad remains.

Long-term exposure of a nature reserve to ultra-low doses of Roundup causes massive losses of biodiversity

Ironically, our Reserve turned out to be a ten-year (2006-2016) observational study of long-term exposure of a Nature Reserve to ultra-low dose Roundup®. By 2013, there were significant declines in biodiversity. By July 2016, our solitary bee hotel was empty, having been full in July 2015. Unbeknown to us, Roundup® was being sprayed on Japanese knotweed outside our area. Japanese knotweed has become a Roundup-resistant super-weed and just grows more strongly each year spray is applied (like super-weeds in GM cropping systems in the US). When EFSA was re-assessing glyphosate registration, the German Rapporteur Member State Federal Pesticide Risk Assessment (BfR) Renewal Assessment Report claimed that glyphosate had minimal effects on biodiversity. I challenged this statement in correspondence with EFSA between October 2015 and February 2016. I even sent a copy of our book to Dr Bernhard Url Executive Director of EFSA. Dr José Tarazona Chief Pesticide Scientist for EFSA replied and said I wasn't to worry because there were data gaps. Yet, despite these 'data gaps', the unelected European Commission re-licensed glyphosate for 18 months while the European Chemical Association (ECHA) produced its verdict.

Monsanto Tribunal has been organized by many NGOs

The Monsanto Tribunal is an international civil society initiative to hold Monsanto accountable for human rights violations, for crimes against humanity, and for ecocide. Eminent judges will hear testimonies from victims, and deliver an advisory opinion following procedures of the International Court of Justice. A parallel People's Assembly provides the opportunity for social movements to rally and plan for the future we want. The Tribunal and People's Assembly will take place between 14 and 16 October 2016 in The Hague, Netherlands.

Pesticide regulators ignored my complaints in order to keep glyphosate on the market

Prof Gilles-Eric S  ralini, one of the organizers of the event, suggested I send a written Testimony to the Monsanto Tribunal about the poisoning of our Nature Reserve with Roundup  . The Monsanto Tribunal begins in The Hague on 14 October 2016. Details of the agenda can be seen at the end of this attached document. **Grave Inaccuracies and Omissions in US EPA Glyphosate Issue Paper: Evaluation of Carcinogenic Potential**²⁶
www.monsanto-tribunal.org

Why are areas growing Roundup   Ready corn and soy in the US biological deserts?

Neither the USDA nor the US EPA has bothered to ask that question. Only the US Geological Survey (USGS) has been measuring pesticides. USGS reported widespread contamination of soil, air, rainwater and river water with glyphosate and its longer-acting metabolite AMPA (α -amino-3-hydroxy-5-methyl-4-isoxazolepropionic acid) in 38 US States. Water samples included streams, groundwater, ditches and drains, large rivers, soil water, lakes, ponds and wetlands, precipitation, soil and sediment, and wastewater treatment plants.

We asked the UK Environment Agency to monitor glyphosate in groundwater

In May 2013, Lord Chris Smith, to whom we had also sent The Year of the Bumblebee in 2010, refused, even though I had sent him a British Geological Survey (BGS) Report of Emerging Contaminants (unpublished) that suggested glyphosate was a herbicide in such widespread use, it should be monitored. BGS has now been partly privatised.

Who was the author of the Renewal Assessment Report?

At first the German RMS Legal Department denied that anyone else was involved. On 15/07/2014 Herr K  nig, on behalf of the BfR Justizariat (Legal Department), said the work on the RAR on glyphosate was *"solely done by the BfR staff members of department no. 6, who are civil servant employees."* Then the cat was out of the bag: the French Press and the President of the European Professional Beekeepers' Association said that the German BfR Committee was full of industry members. Eventually it was admitted that the RMS did not actually review the published toxicology studies themselves, but instead relied on a summary provided to them by the Glyphosate Task Force (GTF). *"Due to the large number of submitted toxicological studies, the RMS was not able to report the original studies in detail and an alternative approach was taken instead."*

EU Commission, EFSA and the UK government are colluding with the Pesticides Industry

The measure of public suspicion in Europe was such that the EU Commission received 1.5 million citizen petitions demanding they not approve glyphosate. When it was clear that some European Commissioners were secretly planning to re-approve it for 15 years, veteran US Journalist William Engdahl reported in an article: The Amazing Glyphosate Revolt Grows²⁷ *"To date the EU Commission has received a staggering 1.5 million citizen petitions demanding they not re-approve glyphosate. The opposition to EU Commission approval of glyphosate has taken on a self-expanding character and that has the agribusiness weed-killer cartel alarmed. The process is exposing to the general public, for the first time in such a clear manner, the degree of corruption in not only Brussels but also in the so-called scientific bodies that advise it on what is safe and what not. ... So a group of manifestly immoral scientists (Boobis & Moretto) led the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR)." Vito Buonsante, a lawyer for the ClientEarth group, in reference to the suspiciously-timed FAO/WHO report stated, "There is a clear conflict of interest here if the review of the safety*

²⁶ <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0385-0094>

²⁷ <http://journal-neo.org/2016/05/23/the-amazing-glyphosate-revolt-grows/>

of glyphosate is carried out by scientists that directly get money from industry."

Is anyone keen on fishing?

On 06/09/2016 Natural Resources Wales (NRW) said fry (juvenile salmon hatched in spring, 2016) are at critically low levels on the rivers Usk, Towy and Clwyd. Three of the best salmon fishing rivers in Wales suddenly have no salmon fry. Has NRW been monitoring aquatic invertebrates on which salmon feed? No, they have been so starved of money that they cannot afford biologists to monitor the aquatic food chain. Invertebrates are the canaries in the coalmine. There are scientific papers to show that aquatic invertebrates are poisoned by glyphosate. Presumably they are vulnerable to pesticides and fertilizer run-off from farmland. Fera figures showed that in 2012 the area treated by glyphosate was 1,750,000 ha. This had increased in 2014 to 2,250,000 ha. Guy Gagen, Chief Arable Adviser for the NFU, says increased glyphosate use (up one third since 2012, to an area the size of Wales) was probably due to treatment of 'black grass.' Black grass is a glyphosate-resistant super-weed just like Japanese knotweed. Herbicide resistant black grass, first seen in 1982 (two years after farmers started spraying glyphosate pre-harvest) and is now found on 16,000 farms in 34 counties. If invertebrates disappear humans won't be far behind. The AM for Natural Resources Wales has written to say that the reassessment of glyphosate is not yet complete! Where is the precautionary principle?

The Oxford Martin Commission resembles 'an all the year round' Bilderberg Group²⁸

The global élite of the business community controls the agenda. Do they have a similar agenda to Bilderberg-Rockefeller scheme? "A New World Order with no middle class, only rulers and servants (serfs), and, of course, no democracy; a zero-growth society without prosperity or progress, only greater wealth and power for the rulers; TTIP that allows Corporations to sue governments. The Bilderberg Group's grand design is for *"a One World Government (World Company) with a single, global marketplace, policed by one world army, and financially regulated by one 'World (Central) Bank' using one global currency."* The Bilderberger-Rockefeller scheme is to make their views *"so appealing (by camouflaging them) that they become public policy (and can) pressure world leaders into submitting to the 'needs of the Masters of the Universe.'*" *"The "free world press" is their instrument to disseminate "agreed-upon propaganda."* Pascal Lamy is a Bilderberger.

It is strange how the same names come up time and time again. When the Doomsday Seed Vault was built in Svalbard in the Arctic, William Engdahl wrote in 2008: ²⁹ *"We can legitimately ask why Bill Gates and the Rockefeller Foundation along with the major genetic engineering agribusiness giants such as DuPont and Syngenta, along with CGIAR (CGIAR Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers) are building the Doomsday Seed Vault in the Arctic. Who uses such a seed bank in the first place? Plant breeders and researchers are the major users of gene banks. Today's largest plant breeders are Monsanto, DuPont, Syngenta and Dow Chemical, the global plant-patenting GMO giants. Since early in 2007 Monsanto holds world patent rights together with the United States Government for plant so-called 'Terminator' or Genetic Use Restriction Technology (GURT). Terminator is an ominous technology by which a patented commercial seed commits 'suicide' after one harvest. Control by private seed companies is total. Such control and power over the food chain has never before in the history of mankind existed."* Engdahl quoted Kissinger: *"As Henry Kissinger declared in the 1970's, 'If you control the oil you control the country; if you control food, you control the population.'"*

²⁸ <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-true-story-of-the-bilderberg-group-and-what-they-may-be-planning-now>

²⁹ <http://www.globalresearch.ca/nato-s-doomsday-seed-vault-in-the-arctic/10300>

Another member of the OM Commission is Julia Marton-Lefèvre. She has just left her post as Director-General of IUCN. She serves as environmental advisor for Dow Chemical Company and The Coca-Cola Company. As a policy fellow, selected by The Rockefeller Foundation, she began a writing project during 2015 at the Foundation's Bellagio Center.

The Report omits any mention of sovereignty

Stewart M Patrick, Senior Fellow and Director of the International Institutions and Global Governance Program, put his finger on an important omission.³⁰ *"The report also omits any mention of the word "sovereignty." This is unfortunate. We may well be moving into an era of multi-stakeholder and multilevel global governance. Still, states remain more important than international organizations, the private sector, NGOs, civil society, or major cities. And it is sovereignty concerns—to protect freedom of action, preserve domestic policy autonomy, or evade the constraints of international law—that constitute one of the biggest impediments to effective multilateral cooperation. Interdependence may be rising, but sovereignty retains its weight."*

The sixth mass extinction and chemicals in the environment: our environmental deficit is now beyond nature's ability to regenerate

An article published in the *Journal of Biological Physics and Chemistry* in September 2015³¹ compared and contrasted two papers about the future of the planet that had appeared within a month of each other (June/July 2015).

Accelerated modern human-induced species losses: Entering the sixth mass extinction was the first (5 pages long).³² The six authors calculated the average rate of vertebrate losses over the last century and compared it with the background rate of losses. They estimated it to be up to 114 times the background rate and asserted that this rate of losses of biodiversity indicated that a sixth mass extinction is already under way. The authors described themselves variously as ecologists, field biologists, paleo-biologists or population biologists, but all held two beliefs in common: that the conservation of natural ecosystems is essential to human health; but that the accelerated losses of biodiversity are a result of human activity.

Safeguarding human health in the Anthropocene epoch: Report of the Rockefeller Foundation–Lancet Commission on planetary health was the second paper (56 pages, with 23 authors). At least 10 of the authors were associated with the Rockefeller Foundation, although only one curriculum vitae acknowledged the fact. Sarah Whitmee was seconded to the Foundation to serve as lead author of the Report and member of the Foundation's secretariat. One author worked as an environmental health scientist in the Office of the Science Adviser at the United States Environmental Protection Agency and was lead author of a recent paper Biodiversity loss affects global disease ecology, but made no mention of pesticides. Most of the remainder are eminent public health doctors. The Rockefeller Foundation funded the initial research on genetically modified organisms in the early 1940s and founded the science of molecular biology, a highly reductionist programme aimed at "understanding" life. The Rockefeller Foundation gives financial support to the global spread of GMO technology; and to research on the biofortification of crops, the introduction of nutrients into crops by genetic engineering techniques for the supposed benefit of third world countries.

³⁰ <http://blogs.cfr.org/patrick/2013/11/06/looking-past-the-inbox-report-of-the-oxford-martin-commission-for-future-generations/>

³¹ <http://www.amsi.ge/jbpc/31515/15-3-abs-5.htm>

³² <http://advances.sciencemag.org/content/advances/1/5/e1400253.full.pdf>

Safeguarding human health in the Anthropocene epoch: Report of the Rockefeller Foundation–Lancet Commission on planetary health³³

The Rockefeller/Lancet Commission on Planetary Health, in common with the Oxford Martin Commission Now for the Long Term, **never mentions pesticides**.

According to the Rockefeller Report, the key drivers of ecosystem change in the last 60 years were: *“Increases in the amounts of nitrogen and phosphorus entering the environment through agricultural fertiliser run-off and soil erosion.”* This is what Defra said in 2011 the Synthesis of the UK National Ecosystem Assessment:³⁴ *“Major increases in fertiliser use, particularly nitrogen and phosphorus, have adversely affected aquatic ecosystems through runoff.”* The scientists who contributed to the 56-page RF/Lancet Commission Report failed to mention the serious threats of exposure to the most widespread chemicals in the global environment, glyphosate (an endocrine and nervous system disruptor) and the systemic neonicotinoid insecticides. Neither of them is routinely measured in the environment by governments or their departments of agriculture. However, there is plenty of evidence that humans and the environment are completely saturated with chemicals.

When discussing overpopulation, why were references to Prof Paul Ehrlich’s work omitted from the RF/Lancet Commission Report?

The Bing Professor of Population Studies in the Department of Biological Sciences at Stanford University and President of Stanford's Center for Conservation Biology, Ehrlich has warned about overpopulation since his first book, the Population Bomb, hit the headlines in 1968.³⁵ Since then, he has written about this phenomenon in increasingly urgent terms.^{36,37} Here are some apposite observations taken from these two works: There have been increasing signs of great toxic peril for humanity and its life-support systems, with a growing threat from the release of hormone-disrupting chemicals that could even be shifting the human sex ratio and reducing sperm counts;

- Agriculture is a leading cause of losses of biodiversity and ecosystem services;
- An industrial agricultural revolution has created a technology-dependent global food system;
- *But* it has also created serious long-run vulnerabilities, especially in its dependence on stable climates, crop monocultures, industrially produced fertilizers and pesticides, petroleum, antibiotic feed supplements and rapid, efficient transportation;
- Farming is a principal source of global toxification, *pace* Rachel Carson;
- Soils are being degraded;
- “Growth can continue forever if it’s in service industries”, and “technological innovation will save us” are fables;
- Worship of “free” markets should be deprecated;
- Without significant pressure from the public demanding action, we fear there is little chance of changing course fast enough to forestall disaster;
- This will require developing mechanisms to force big corporations (including those in big agriculture and big pharma) to bear social responsibilities like the real individuals whose rights they legally want to assume;
- Adverse symptoms of exposure to synthetic chemicals are making some scientists increasingly nervous about effects on the human population;
- Elected officials and other leaders have almost no knowledge of science.

³³ <http://www.thelancet.com/commissions/planetary-health>

³⁴ http://archive.defra.gov.uk/environment/natural/documents/UKNEA_SynthesisReport.pdf

³⁵ Ehrlich, P. R. *The Population Bomb*. New York: Buccaneer Books (1968).

³⁶ <http://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.1000330>

³⁷ <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.short>

The nineteen international leaders of the Oxford Martin Commission are from government, business and civil society. Where is the proper field biologist?

Every one of the 200 field biologists that were made redundant when the UK Government closed down the Wildlife Research Centres in 2006 could tell them the following:

- That weeds develop resistance to herbicides
- That insects become resistant to insecticides
- That measurements are crucial to biology
- That rivers have aquatic food chains that sustain fish
- Humans need invertebrates; without them they cannot survive. Prof E.O. Wilson the eminent field entomologist from Harvard, who in his book *Naturalist*, has documented massive global declines of ant colonies at the hand of man, said: *"The one process now going on that will take millions of years to correct is the loss of genetic and species diversity by the destruction of natural habitats. This is the folly our descendants are least likely to forgive us."*
- Two British public health doctors had been signatories to The Faroes Statement in 2007: "The periods of embryonic, foetal and infant development are remarkably susceptible to environmental hazards. Toxic exposures to chemical pollutants during these windows of increased susceptibility can cause disease and disability in infants, children and across the entire span of human life. But they were ignored. Effects of exposure of the brains of unborn and young children in the UK to chemicals is reflected in OECD PISA figures for declining educational achievement in 2013. In 2000, the UK was in 4th place: but by 2013 they were in 26th place for mathematics and 23rd for reading. A 2016 study also shows that in England the young have lower basic skills than their counterparts in Europe. That's why our European colleagues say that the British people are being used as **LAB RATS**.
- That all humans exposed to chemicals in the environment will be affected

Humans and the environment are being silently poisoned by thousands of untested and unmonitored chemicals³⁸

This is according to the International Federation of Gynecologists and Obstetrics Opinion on reproductive health impacts of exposure to toxic environmental chemicals. Three are from the UK, one from Canada, eight from the USA and one from the World Health Organisation.

The Agrochemical Corporations have created a toxic environment from which none can escape. This is what I warned Sir John Beddington in March 2011, but he failed to reply. The devastating effects of these silent killers in our environment do not distinguish between farmers or city dwellers, the wealthy or the poor, between media moguls, editors or their reporters, Monsanto or Syngenta Executives, Prime Ministers or Presidents.

Rosemary Mason MB ChB FRCA
04/10/2016

The British Media and Public Health England are concealing the truth about vaccines. Is that because the Pharmaceutical Industry is giving large amounts of money for research?

In 2012 a British Court threw out the conviction of Dr Andrew Wakefield and Professor John Walker-Smith by the General Medical Council (GMC).³⁹ Justice John Mitting ruled on the appeal by Walker-Smith, saying that the GMC *"panel's determination cannot stand. I*

³⁸ http://www.figo.org/sites/default/files/uploads/News/Final%20PDF_8462.pdf

³⁹ <http://healthimpactnews.com/2012/british-court-throws-out-conviction-of-autismvaccine-md-andrew-wakefields-co-author-completely-exonerated/>

therefore quash it.” He said that its conclusions were based on “inadequate and superficial reasoning and, in a number of instances, a wrong conclusion.” In 1998 The Lancet published a case series on twelve children receiving treatment for bowel dysfunction at the Royal Free Hospital in London. The paper called for further study of a possible association between bowel disease and developmental delay, including cases of autism. It also noted that eight of the children’s gastrointestinal and autistic symptoms began shortly after they received the MMR vaccination. “It is quite obvious to me that James Murdoch, Brian Deer (The Sunday Times journalist) and GlaxoSmithKline orchestrated the smear attack on Dr. Andrew Wakefield,” said Ginger Taylor, Executive Director of the Canary Party. “A judge has now ruled that the GMC hearings were a farce. Parents are waiting for journalists to find their spine and start some honest reporting on the character assassination of doctors that is blocking medical treatments for vaccine injured children, and the role that GSK and Merck may be playing to protect their profits on the MMR vaccine.”

Appendix

CDC, Monsanto and Bayer Cornering the Public; Follow the Money, Follow 1918

Posted on [September 29, 2016](#)

<http://www.naturalblaze.com/2016/09/cdc-monsanto-bayer-1918-vaccines-pesticides-flu-rockefeller.html>

Op-ed by [Tim Tucker](#)

It was an immense false flag and it shifted the direction of all medical science in a disastrous industrial direction, and has never – even up to today – been exposed.

All the false flag researchers were not around to point it out. But they are now and it’s key to stopping this Bayer and Monsanto repeat of 1918.

Take a [good look at Bush and the set up for now](#). The CDC’s roll-out of mandatory vaccines (unknown, untested and unlimited) is combined with the ability to take away anyone who is traveling – or at home – and “treat” them with unspecified treatments.

Now no one has to accuse people of anything radical in order to pick them up and forcibly vaccinate or quarantine them. Officials can simply claim the person doesn’t look well. They can take the person away and inject any number of unknown vaccines into them (as they did in 1918) for being “behind schedule” or charge them \$100,000 per “event” if they refuse. And if a neighbor dies, they can be charged \$250,000 for that.

Explore [ALERT U.S. CDC Giving Itself Unconstitutional POWERS To Round Up And Detain Citizens En Masse Anytime, Anywhere And Throw Away The Key](#)

The [CDC](#), [CIA](#), Rockefeller Foundation, and Operation Paperclip are connected and they have utterly blindsided the false flag community. While researchers may have a template for one kind of false flag, pharmaceutical industry false flags (including bioweapons) are different. The media and “health officials” can say anything about what is occurring since you can’t see anything to the contrary. They can spray people and watch them fall ill later. After that, they can kill vast numbers of people with their toxic solutions (vaccines and other “treatments”) to “save” them.

So, here is THE false flag of false flags everyone has missed – the one the elite are moving forward on right now, only greatly ramped up.

Take a look at the series “Bayer And Aspirin” published by the Food Freedom website:

Part 1: [Bayer and Death: 1918 And Aspirin](#)

Please note that Monsanto was involved in the 1918 deaths. In 1917, Bayer, the then German competition cut prices in an effort to drive Monsanto out of business, but it failed to do so. Soon, Monsanto diversified into phenol (a World War I-era antiseptic), and Aspirin when Bayer’s German patent expired in 1917. Monsanto began making Aspirin, and soon

became the largest manufacturer world-wide.

Part 2: [Aspirin Killed, Homeopathy Saved](#)

Part 3: [Vaccines and CDC's Myth of a 1918 Virus](#)

[Scientifically Proven Method to Reverse Diabetes \(Ad\)](#)

Part 4: [Aspirin Deaths Continue Beyond 1918](#)

Part 5: [A New Set of Questions About 1918](#)

In addition, to the Food Freedom series, there are number of other missing pieces that must be put together.

Part 6: [Bayer and WWII](#) – Look what they did [20 years later](#) and how they experimented with vaccines

Part 7: [Bayer Inherits Nazi funds](#)

Part 8: [Bayer and Bees](#)

Part 9: [Bayer and Monsanto](#)

Part 10: [Bayer and Terrorism](#)

Part 11: [Monsanto creates Sudden Death Syndrome in Plants, and Bayer funds mapping the pathogen](#)

You can see the various shapes of the grand scheme of the ultimate false flag but the vaccines are the most visible totalitarian incarnation of it.

As Exopolitics writes in the article "[Part One: Bush and 9/11 Using Explosives, Part Two: Rockefellers And A Coup, Using Bioweapons,](#)"

Those who did 9/11 aren't finished. Part 1 was bombs. Part 2 is bioweapons. That's what the banking/corporate take over of the US is planned to be accomplished with. Knowing that the Rockefellers control the CIA and funded IG Farben and ALL the gruesome, sadistic, murderous experiments there and brought Nazis scientists here and put Nazis in the CIA and never stopped funding appalling experiments after WWII, how many times do they need to say **ebola** (which the CIA controlled CDC created and patented) or that **ISIS** (which the CIA created) **has weaponized ebola and will attack the US**, before our penny drops?

And who's to argue with protection of the public through mandated vaccines?

The Rockefellers are continuing the grotesque Nazi experiments and they are behind all the vaccines and the push for mandate vaccines.

We are now in the second stage.

You can also see that [Jesuits are directly involved](#). It was the Jesuits at Georgetown University who were involved with Johns Hopkins who wrote the [Model State Emergency Health Powers Act](#) which is the basis of the recently CDC roll-out of forced vaccines and detaining anyone they want, at airports, crossing state lines, etc. for (unknown, untested, and unlimited) vaccines and medical "treatments."

They [also started the Tuskegee experiment](#) which ran for 40 years, even before the Nazi experiments the Rockefellers funded. In is important to note that the CDC ran that experiment for 15 of those years.

Take a good look at the vaccines themselves. The [new ones are mostly DNA vaccines](#) which have never even been approved for human use and contain viruses that are banned from vaccines since 1963 because they absolutely cause cancer.

Monsanto made DDT which is now believed to be what caused the polio "epidemic" and the Rockefellers were [heavily involved in the pervasiveness](#) of DDT. They created the vaccines and had control of all medical and relevant governmental agencies so no one found out a safe, cheap, [CURE for polio](#) (and ultimately for all other viral diseases) was discovered in 1949, 6 years before the vaccines were to come out.

The world could have been free of every viral disease as a result of this cure.

Instead the Rockefellers have been making new ones and [using them for mass murder](#) and for control of countries ([ebola was created by the CDC and used to bring US troops into oil](#)

[rich west Africa, for instance](#)). And with what they have planned now with forced vaccines and insane penalties, they hope to destroy the US and take everything. Remember that neurotoxins like DDT and other pesticides [cause neurological conditions](#) that are exactly like polio.

Now, [because of the Zika hoax](#), cities are being sprayed with those very toxins.

You notice cities are being sprayed with those toxins now [because of the Zika hoax](#)?

The first thing people trust – medicine – is where the attack is coming from. It's like a Russian egg because inside that first egg are things people trust – vaccines – having been told endlessly they were good for them but which they don't know about, and inside that is the CDC helping them and inside that is military force, and but deep, deep inside it all something else is hidden – the bankrupting of everyone and seizure of everything.

That inner egg needs to be blown out into the open. It is like following the money for 9/11.

There's no arguing.

The money part is mind-boggling. The financial rape of the country has been set up under the CDC! But look at the CDC and the CIA and you will see the whole thing is being run by the Rockefellers, the bankers, and oil magnates who funded Hitler and, before that, took over all the medical schools after 1918 and crushed homeopathy which actually saved people.

What's more, the [CDC took the Massachusetts mandatory vaccine bill](#) as the blueprint and spearhead for their own agenda. Notice this one small aspect of an incredibly dangerous bill: (1) the exercise of their powers over routes of transportation and over materials and facilities including but not limited to communication devices, carriers, public utilities, fuels, food, clothing, and shelter;

An odd thing to add to a health bill, no?

But darned if it doesn't intersect nicely with Executive Order 13603.

Now the [CDC's new regulations have gone](#) and made the financial rape part many times worse adding forced quarantine, detention, and treatment to the list. Fortunately, however, that makes the money part many times more useful. It brings everyone together.

It's not a theory. It's NOT terrifying. It's enraging.

Those who planned all this counted on people backing away from vaccine stuff or martial law/control stuff – not wanting to know “conspiracy things.”

But people want to know about money.

Go after the money and part of the CDC's actions and we can blow this whole agenda all sky high. Let's hear from the money analysts! They will have a field day. The bankers intend to turn on vaccines like some gigantic vacuum cleaner and suck up every dustball and lint of value in the country. And yes, [they'll be causing disease](#) like crazy. People will be dying and others will be waiting with their terrible “solutions.”

But remember that [it was natural treatments that saved peoples' lives during 1918](#).

For this reason, at the same moment that the CDC is rolling out forced vaccines, the FDA, run by Monsanto lawyer [Michael Taylor and his wife](#), are [making a dramatic move](#) to [remove natural supplements](#) from the country.

Undermining US law for the benefit of multinational corporations is a family affair in the Taylor household. To see how the concept of “risk assessment” can be usefully abused, let's look at how Mrs. Michael Taylor adopts the conceit to her purposes.

Christine Lewis Taylor, a veteran FDA employee, has been busy working up the “scientific” justification for placing a cap on the level of nutrients people should be allowed to consume.

To do so, she pushes a perverse concept that defines nutrients as toxins. In other words, Mrs. Taylor would like us all to believe that the vitamins and minerals needed by cells throughout the body in order to function and detoxify should be considered hazardous, requiring governmental oversight that would limit people's exposure to them under law.

Those behind this massive 1918-like vaccine push are simultaneously removing nutrients that actually worked to save lives in 1918. Bayer and Monsanto were involved in 1918 and Monsanto is involved now. Those behind the vaccine push know people are increasingly aware that vaccines can harm. They have arranged that avoiding their “medical solutions” (unknown, untested, unlimited vaccines, as well as drugs, and unspecified treatments), will bring absolute total financial disaster.

So, right NOW, we have to go after the financial part which is in writing and can’t be denied. Americans will not shy away from that information but welcome it.

[Image source](#)

This post ([CDC, Monsanto and Bayer Cornering the Public; Follow the Money, Follow 1918](#)) by [Tim Tucker](#) originally appeared [here](#) on [NaturalBlaze.com](#) It can be republished provided that all internal links and this message remain intact.