



Is the Boycott Strategy Working?

It's boycott time again. With less than two weeks to go before voters in Oregon and Colorado decide on ballot initiatives to require mandatory labeling of foods containing GMOs, the Junk Food Giants are at it again. According to the numbers provided by the pro-labeling campaigns, as of Oct. 22, the opposition in Oregon has raised \$16.5 million to defeat Measure 92, while opponents of Colorado's Proposition 105 have raised \$14.3 million.

Monsanto is the largest donor to both campaigns, with combined donations totaling approximately \$8.8 million. While Dow has spent only \$668,000 total in both states, DuPont Pioneer recently dumped a whopping \$3 million into the Colorado NO on Prop 105 war chest. Apart from Monsanto, and DuPont Pioneer, the most prolific donors have been multinational food corporations. Many of these corporations own organic and "natural" brands—brands we've been asking consumers to boycott ever since Big Food helped defeat Proposition 37, California's citizen-led GMO labeling initiative, in 2012.

Has the boycott strategy worked? Aside from a couple of exceptions, the boycott clearly hasn't kept Big Food from continuing to make anti-labeling campaign contributions. But there's evidence that the reputations, and in some cases, revenues, of some of the natural and organic brands have suffered. And even more evidence to suggest that some of their parent companies, including Coca-Cola and General Mills, are struggling to overcome declining profits and consumer distrust. This much is clear: It's time to step up the pressure on all of the brands owned by companies that are pouring millions of dollars into defeating your right to know. orgcns.org/1DwRcmh

Whatever It Takes

When the National Organic Standards Board (NOSB) meets October 28 - 30, the board is expected to review a long list of non-organic and synthetic ingredients that have been allowed in organic, but should be removed. It's always been an uphill battle to keep non-organic and synthetic materials out of organic. But last year, the USDA's National Organic Program (NOP) made it even more difficult, when NOP Director Miles McEvoy changed something called the "sunset process." "Sunset" refers to a requirement of the Organic Foods Production Act (OFPA), that the use of an approved non-organic or synthetic material expire after five years, unless the NOSB votes to "re-list" it (keep the material on the National List of Approved and Prohibited Substances).

Under the sunset process in place since the first NOSB convened in 1992, it took a decisive vote of 10 out of the NOSB's board's 15 members to keep a non-organic or synthetic material in organic.

Under the changes made by McEvoy, it now takes only six of 15 NOSB members to keep a non-organic or synthetic material in organic. This violates OFPA's requirement for a 2/3 vote on all motions. How do we hope to make any progress at this year's meeting, toward getting non-organic and synthetic materials that don't belong in organic, out of organic? The NOSB could still make an end run around McEvoy's power grab. By refusing to vote. NOSB review is required under the OFPA, if the NOSB won't review or vote on a "sunset material" that material can't get back on the National List. Take Action: orgcns.org/1DwRFEU



Secret Weapon

As election day approaches, Monsanto and Big Food are flooding the airwaves in Oregon and in Colorado. The last thing they want is for either of these states to pass a GMO labeling initiative. They have their millions. But we have a secret weapon: you! Oregon's Measure 92, and Colorado's Prop 105, urgently need volunteers to call voters. Research shows that calling voters, and talking to them one-on-one, helps get out the vote.

Never volunteered for a phone bank before? No worries. Sign up and you'll receive (very easy) instructions. It doesn't matter where you live. It won't cost you anything except an hour or two of your time. And it could make all the difference. Sign up for Colorado: orgcns.org/1vU1x9d

Sign up for Oregon: orgcns.org/1nUbtAp

Donate to support Yes on 92 and Prop 105: orgcns.org/1qVHTtV

Money Talks Back

Money talks. But it doesn't necessarily speak the truth. Monsanto has spent millions wooing mainstream media with its web of lies. The Gene Giant's flacks have no doubt patted themselves on the back each time a major publication, like *Scientific American* and *The New Yorker* have taken a swig of the Kool-Aid. But one of the anti-GMO movement's leaders is fighting back. By buying full-page ads, in *The New Yorker*, *Scientific American*, *Harpers*, *Harvard*, *The Nation*, *Mother Jones*, *The Progressive*, and *Thrive* magazines, to refute one of Monsanto's favorite myths—that GMO crops lead to a reduction in pesticide use. This month, Dr. Bronner's Magic Soaps, is running a full-page advertorial by company president David Bronner. It's called: "Herbicide and Insecticide Use on GMO Crops Skyrocketing while Pro-GMO Media Runs Interference; Former EPA Senior Scientist's New Article Sets Record Straight." The advertorial summarizes "Pesticide Use on Genetically Engineered Crops," a whitepaper by Dr. Ramon J. Seidler, a former EPA scientist.

Seidler's work documents the rapid widespread failure of the Bt insecticidal trait in GE corn in the face of emerging resistance in target insects, leading to huge increases in both systemic insecticides that coat seeds, and pre-emergent insecticides injected directly into soil. He also documents the still under-reported failure of herbicide-tolerant traits leading to huge increases in herbicide use. Read the advertorial: orgcns.org/1DwYh69

Read Dr. Seidler's article: orgcns.org/1DwYw18

Not. Safe.

Ever since former Monsanto lawyer Michael Taylor co-authored the FDA substantial equivalency policy, which said that genetically modified foods are no different than non-GMO foods, independent scientists (and consumers) have been skeptical. To say the least. Now yet another new published review, by researchers at the University of Adelaide, Flinders University and the Institute of Health and Environmental Research supports, again, our long-held belief that there isn't enough evidence to conclude that GMO crops are safe to eat. What these scientists found may not surprise you. But it will probably get your blood boiling. After you've calmed down...this would be a great study to share with anyone who tells you GMO foods are "perfectly safe." orgcns.org/1DwYC94

Read the study: orgcns.org/1nQwV9c