



BBC News recently hosted Jonathan Jones, who strikes us like the old guy with the overbearing wife in *Pink Floyd—The Wall*. As a dog returneth to its vomit, we are compelled to again take up genetic engineering of the food supply.

Puzzling Sports

Jesse Ross
www.PuzzlingSports.com

First Things First →

Instructions: Each question lists two historic events: one soccer-related, the other something completely different. You must figure out which happened first and circle your choice. Good luck!

- 1) **A** Major League Soccer played its first game
B The Nintendo Entertainment System (NES) played its first game in 1983
- 2) **A** FIFA was formed
B The first TV show aired in 1928
- 3) **A** Castleton State College became the first American school to establish a varsity women's soccer program
B In 1969, Neil Armstrong became the first man on the moon
- 4) **A** The first official Olympic soccer tourney was held in London
B Thomas Edison invented the light bulb in 1879
- 5) **A** Jamie Moreno passed Jason Kreis as the MLS all-time leading scorer
B The world population reached 6.5 billion in 2006

Crumpet-eaters with bad teeth for biotech

Regular readers may recall we dropped a house on *New Scientist* magazine [“Annotated GMO puff piece,” September 29, 2009] after they published a particularly worthless promotion of genetic engineering. Our superfat web exclusive can be found at ZenithCityNews.com and contains a nauseating amount of detail (and links) as to why genetic engineering in agriculture is a scientific clusterfuck of epic proportions.

In this thrilling installment, we go after Jones, who elevated condescension to an artform with his July 6 column, “Fussy eaters—what’s wrong with GM food?” We now realize our criticism of genetic engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms has been insufficiently caustic. Sweet Mother of Christ, what is it about these English biotech boosters that is so annoying?

Fussy eaters? For real? A few choice quotes: “Some fear GM food is bad for health. There are no data that support this view.”

What’s that, Jonathan? You’re mumbling. We can’t hear you. Oh, you’ve got the biotech industry’s throbbing member in your mouth.

Juvenile? You’re goddamn right. But it is astonishing your statements pass as scientific and go unchallenged by your editors at the BBC.

No data? Oh, well, I guess we’ll just close up shop then. Thanks for coming, everybody.

Oh, wait. There’s data archived on the *Zenith’s* website. We’ll send you the link, BBC. Perhaps you can defend the honor of *New Scientist’s* Michael LePage as well. He never did get around to responding to us.

A person could make a career out of studying biotech propaganda. Biotech interests are the modern masters of manufacturing consent.

Step One: Deny that your critics have any data or valid points whatsoever. It’s ingenious.

Jones: “In the US, where many processed foods contain ingredients derived from GM maize or soy, in the most litigious society in history, nobody has sued for a GM health problem.”

It’s appropriate to wonder how stupid Jones thinks his readers are.

Surely he is aware of the lengths to which the industry and their government lackeys have gone to prevent labeling of engineered food, explicitly stymieing the possibility of a paper trail with which to establish that a given illness resulted from consuming engineered food.

This refusal to label is based on the dubious assertion that engineered food is “substantially equivalent” to non-transgenic food.

Lest we forget, the only *long-term* animal feeding study *ever conducted* found that lab rats fed engineered potatoes had suppressed immune systems and internal organs that failed to grow fully.

But because engineered food is considered “substantially equivalent” to conventional food, it would be nearly impossible for your average citizen to prove, scientifically or legally, that their health was negatively impacted by eating unlabeled engineered food.

Jones: “Some fear GM is bad for the environment. But in agriculture, idealism does not solve problems. Farmers need ‘least bad’ solutions; they do not have the luxury of insisting on utopian solutions.”

Classic biotech reasoning, with all the arrogant haughtiness we’ve come to enjoy. Nobody does patronizing like the English.

Doesn’t *the luxury of insisting on utopian solutions* conjure up hordes of impractical hippies, dooming the world to starvation by stubbornly resisting the forced consumption of an untested technology aggressively promoted by some of the least credible institutions?

Jones: “It is less bad to control weeds with a rapidly inactivated herbicide after the crop germinates, than to apply more persistent chemicals beforehand.”

This fucking guy gets more condescending as he goes. The majority of GM crops are engineered to withstand applications of the herbicide Roundup, making weeding with chemicals seductively easy.

Jones completely ignores all the data demonstrating that Roundup is not as harmless as we’ve been told. Weeds are gaining resistance to it like gangbusters, thus requiring the harsher chemicals Roundup Ready technology is allegedly replacing.

“Just as the heavy use of antibiotics contributed to the rise of drug-resistant supergerms, American farmers’ near-ubiquitous use of the weedkiller Roundup has led to the rapid growth of tenacious new superweeds” [“Farmers cope with Roundup-resistant weeds,” *New York Times*, May 3, 2010].

In addition, new lines of GM crops are now being engineered to withstand increased doses of chemicals. Thanks, BBC, for giving this idiot a fact-free platform!

MayDay!

Carl Sack is taking a well earned vacation.

MayDay! will return August 31.