

An OSINT Analysis of Monsanto's Organic Crimes

Gemini Assistant

July 3, 2025

Abstract

This report provides a structured Open-Source Intelligence (OSINT) investigation into the corporate practices of Monsanto, now a subsidiary of Bayer AG, framed within the principles of "Organic Law." The analysis confirms and expands upon allegations of systemic criminality across three principal domains: the manipulation of scientific discourse, ecocide resulting from its flagship product glyphosate, and the violation of life and food sovereignty. The findings are substantiated by a review of publicly available internal documents, court records, regulatory filings, peer-reviewed scientific studies, and investigative journalism.

1 Manipulation of Science: A Calculated Campaign of Deception

The allegation of manipulating scientific discourse is substantiated by extensive evidence from the "Monsanto Papers," internal corporate documents released through litigation [1]. These records reveal a deliberate strategy to not only promote the perceived safety of its herbicide, Roundup, but to actively undermine and discredit any science that posed a threat to its commercial interests.

1.1 Ghostwriting and the Illusion of Independent Science

Internal Monsanto emails expose a clear-cut practice of "ghostwriting," where company scientists would draft or heavily influence scientific papers that were then published under the names of seemingly independent academics. One of the most cited examples is a 2000 paper which concluded that glyphosate, the active ingredient in Roundup, was safe. A senior Monsanto scientist, William Heydens, is on record as having proposed ghostwriting entire sections of a new manuscript to be published under the names of outside scientists [2].

This practice was further supported by the creation of front groups. "Academics Review," for instance, presented itself as an independent source of scientific information but was, in fact, funded by Monsanto to discredit the 2015 report by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) [3], which classified glyphosate as "probably carcinogenic to humans" [4].

1.2 Discrediting Critics and Controlling the Narrative

Beyond ghostwriting, Monsanto employed a multi-pronged strategy to neutralize dissenting voices. The "Monsanto Papers" reveal the existence of an "intelligence fusion center" to monitor and target journalists and activists. The company maintained a "let nothing go" program, a specific strategy to ensure that any negative information or reporting, particularly on social media, was countered with pro-Monsanto messaging [5]. This involved cultivating relationships with reporters and deploying consultants to ensure favorable coverage and undermine critical reporting.

2 Ecocide via Glyphosate: A Trail of Environmental Devastation

The charge of "ecocide" is supported by both internal company knowledge of risks and the widespread, documented ecological impact of glyphosate-based herbicides.

2.1 Decades of Foreknowledge

Evidence suggests that Monsanto was aware of the potential health and environmental risks of glyphosate decades before they became a matter of public and regulatory concern. Internal studies from as early as the 1980s indicated potential for adverse effects, including kidney damage and tumor formation in laboratory animals. Despite this internal knowledge, the company continued to aggressively market Roundup as safe, a narrative that has since been challenged in court [6].

2.2 Carcinogenicity, Legal Ramifications, and Ecosystem Collapse

The 2015 IARC classification of glyphosate as a probable human carcinogen became a pivotal moment, opening the floodgates for mass litigation. By 2020, Bayer had agreed to pay over \$10 billion to settle more than 100,000 lawsuits from individuals in the U.S. who claimed Roundup caused their non-Hodgkin's lymphoma [7].

The ecological damage extends beyond direct human health impacts. The widespread use of glyphosate with herbicide-resistant crops has led to a dramatic decline in milkweed, the sole food source for monarch butterfly larvae. Peer-reviewed scientific studies have directly linked the increase in glyphosate use to the crashing populations of this iconic pollinator, a clear example of ecocide through the disruption of a keystone species [8].

3 Violation of Life & Food Sovereignty: Patenting, Policing, and Technology

Monsanto's business model, particularly concerning genetically modified organisms (GMOs), fundamentally challenged traditional farming practices and the concept of seed ownership, aligning with the violation of life and food sovereignty.

3.1 The Legal Framework for Owning Life

The 1980 U.S. Supreme Court case *Diamond v. Chakrabarty* set a crucial precedent by ruling that a living, human-made microorganism is patentable subject matter [9]. This landmark decision paved the way for companies like Monsanto to patent genetically modified seeds, effectively transforming a product of nature and centuries of agricultural selection into a privately owned and controlled corporate asset.

3.2 Aggressive Enforcement and "Terminator" Technology

This patent ownership was aggressively enforced. The case of Canadian farmer Percy Schmeiser is a landmark example. Schmeiser was sued by Monsanto for patent infringement after his fields were found to contain Roundup Ready canola, which he maintained was due to accidental contamination. The Supreme Court of Canada ultimately sided with Monsanto on the patent issue, establishing a powerful precedent for patent-holders over farmers [10].

Furthermore, Monsanto's development of "Terminator" seed technology (Gene Protection Technology), which would produce sterile seeds, represented a direct attempt to eliminate the age-old practice of farmers saving seeds from their harvest. While this technology was never commercialized due to widespread public and farmer outcry, its development underscores a corporate strategy aimed at complete control over the food supply [11].

4 Conclusion

The evidence drawn from open-source intelligence presents a compelling case against Monsanto's practices. The deliberate manipulation of science, the conscious disregard for ecological integrity leading to ecocidal outcomes, and the systematic violation of food sovereignty through patenting and aggressive legal action constitute a pattern of behavior that prioritizes profit over the well-being of people and the planet. The legal and financial repercussions now faced by its parent company, Bayer, are a testament to the growing public and judicial recognition of these actions.

References

- [1] Carey Gillam. *Whitewash: The Story of a Weed Killer, Cancer, and the Corruption of Science*. Island Press, 2017. (This book is a comprehensive summary of the findings from the Monsanto Papers).
- [2] Hakim, Danny. "Monsanto Papers: Internal Emails Show Effort to Ghostwrite Roundup Studies." *The New York Times*, August 1, 2017.
- [3] International Agency for Research on Cancer. "IARC Monograph on Glyphosate." Volume 112, 2015.
- [4] U.S. Right to Know. "Academics Review: The Making of a Monsanto Front Group." July 2018.
- [5] Levin, Sam. "Revealed: Monsanto's 'intelligence center' targeted journalists and activists." *The Guardian*, August 8, 2019.
- [6] Baum, Hedlund, Aristei Goldman, P.C. "Monsanto's Secret Documents." (Summary of internal studies revealed during litigation). Accessed July 2024.
- [7] Feig, Jonathan. "Bayer to pay up to \$10.9 billion to settle bulk of Roundup cancer lawsuits." *Reuters*, June 24, 2020.
- [8] Pleasants, J. M., & Oberhauser, K. S. "Milkweed loss in agricultural fields because of herbicide use: a potential demographic bottleneck for the monarch butterfly." *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 6(2), 135-144, 2013.
- [9] *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. 303 (1980).
- [10] *Monsanto Canada Inc. v. Schmeiser*, [2004] 1 S.C.R. 902, 2004 SCC 34.
- [11] ETC Group. "Terminator Technology." (Various reports and briefings on the history and implications of Gene Use Restriction Technologies). Accessed July 2024.