

Sunday, May 10, 2009, opednews.com

[CODEX inside HR 875 - Growing Herbs Becomes A Crime](#)

B. Mosher commented on "Monsanto's Dream Bill - HR 875," only one of many fake "food safety" bills in Congress. Mr. Mosher saw even more dangers than the person who wrote the article had already seen and his comment deserves attention:

But for those who have never heard of it, an introduction to CODEX may help.

[CODEX is a plan by the pharmaceutical industry and the WTO to take control over all nutrients worldwide](#) by declaring them toxins and putting them under governments' control, thus not allowing anyone adequate access to natural substances, supplements, vitamins, or minerals to treat their own health, leaving only expensive pharmaceuticals available for treating diseases.

In place already in the EU, CODEX has meant that small bottles of supplements can run \$150 or more and each capsule contains as little as 5 mg or 10 mg, making it impossible for anyone to get enough of any nutrient for any benefit. Here, we can buy 1000 mg tablets of many kinds of nutrients for \$12. In Canada, Bill C-51, representing the same pharmaceutical plan to take over nutrients, goes so far as to redefine "sell" to mean to "distributing to one, two or more people even without consideration," making sharing or giving or donating a "sale."

Thus, giving one's own family herbal tea could be defined as selling a controlled substance. Giving chamomile to your child could be considered selling drugs to a minor. A person producing herbs could be charged as a drug dealer. The penalties in Bill C-51 would be 5 million dollars and 2 years in prison for producing, taking or "selling" vitamin C, for instance.

[It appears that Big Pharm and Big Pharma both contributed to writing these bills.]

With that background on CODEX, here is Mr. Mosher's comment.

Implementation of Codex Alimentarius?

Well, I've gone through the whole bill now, and wrote notes totaling 12 pages... I'm not going to post them - don't worry.

This bill scares the hell out of me.

"The bill is monstrous on level after level - the power it would give to Monsanto, the criminalization of seed banking, the prison terms and confiscatory fines for farmers, the 24 hours GPS tracking of their

animals, the easements on their property to allow for warrantless government entry, the stripping away of their property rights, the imposition by the filthy, greedy industrial side of anti-farming international "industrial" standards to independent farms - the only part of our food system that still works, the planned elimination of farmers through all these means."

Considering the author of the bill [Monsanto], this author's fear is entirely valid, but the wording in this paragraph could easily be brushed aside as sensationalistic conspiracy theory - a great thing for the bill's supporters. Through pointing at people like the author, they can say "see, it couldn't be as bad as he says it is, so it must be fine. If you question it, you must be as crazy as he is!"

Everything that he's saying is entirely possible, and probable, but in order to get serious attention, his tone should change. It needs to change, because the truth of the first line in the paragraph above goes waaaaaay beyond the surface he's scratched.

Yes - this bill would be devastating to small farms, and an enormous boon to both Monsanto and Stanley Greenburg. Even if he's not appointed as the "Administrator of Food Safety," and someone who didn't introduce rBGH was installed for political reasons, the bill provides for the hiring of "Experts and Consultants" who receive both a salary and ALL expenses covered while in the Agency's employ, and the creation of "advisory committees that consist of representatives of scientific expert bodies, academics, **industry specialists**, and consumers."

Either of these positions could create a figurehead situation like the Bush/Cheney relationship, leading to Monsanto's continued growth and influence, and the continued push toward a world where all food is patented. These things are all probable, but unsubstantiated in the language of the bill.

The really scary stuff is in the text of the bill itself, and goes beyond peddling influence to Monsanto.

The really scary stuff is **the direct paraphrasing of [Codex Alimentarius](#) initiatives opportunistically** wedged between seemingly rational improved safeguards for the general public in food production and distribution that will be readily accepted by a populace scared to death by their peanut butter and baby formula. These provisions are dissected into a form that most people won't have the time or patience to digest, due to **incomprehensibility that one gifted in legalese can create when they want certain negative specifics overlooked in deference to the overall facade they wish to be seen.**

The most drastic change this bill tries to impose is the re-definition and restructuring of the "Food and Drug Administration," the FDA.

in the bill's own words:

"Renaming and Reservation of Agency Identity- The Food and Drug Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services is hereby renamed the Federal Drug and Device Administration and may be referred to as 'FDA'."

I find it pretty sinister, completely revamping the direction of a well known agency, yet keeping the acronym exactly the same, leaving unwitting people to assume that nothing's changed...

there's also a provision that automatically transfers previously registered food related businesses under a recognized, long-standing code of law to the restrictions and responsibilities of this bill:

"(C)Transitional Provision- During the 6-month period following the date of the enactment of this Act, a food establishment is deemed to be registered in accordance with this section if the establishment is registered under section 415 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 350d)."

So this bill, if passed, automatically registers unwitting farmers and processors to its provisions, without notice - there's got to be something illegal in that - basically shifting restrictions and responsibilities from one contract to another without consent.

...This change brings all kinds of new areas under their jurisdiction, from surveillance of businesses and livestock, to the main crux of the fear of Codex standards being implemented - a complete and total revamping of what can be labeled as a "contaminant."

Previously, dietary supplements, such as vitamins and minerals, couldn't be regulated by the FDA. Under this bill, a food-borne illness outbreak is defined as:

"the occurrence of 2 or more cases of a similar illness resulting from the ingestion of a common food."

Now, those things that cause an "outbreak" are considered "contaminants."

[\[This article explains who is behind the bills and about CODEX.\]](#)

both vitamin c and magnesium can cause diarrhea in some people at currently acceptable dosage levels. Magnesium will do it to almost anyone if they take the entire current RDA (500 mg.) at the same time. If two people get diarrhea from either of these substances, their status as "contaminants" will be cemented, putting them under the regulation of these agencies under DHHS.

More on the contaminant thing...

The bill states that the Administrator of Food Safety only has to come up with a list of "contaminants" they will regulate SIX MONTHS AFTER enactment of the bill. This means that congress will have a bill in front of them that every fan of peanut butter

will want passed *from its name alone*, yet not have any idea what this person, (be they an employee of Monsanto, or a pharmaceutical company, or a tobacco executive, or a health-food guru,) intends to regulate or outlaw. Codex specialists insist that codex will eventually implement a Napoleonic code of what we'll be allowed to consume. This sure sounds like a beginning of that to me.

back to the "outbreak" issue...

the bill constantly focuses on what it calls "specific categories of consumers" like in this section:

"(B) Comprehensive Analysis- The program shall be based on a comprehensive analysis of the hazards associated with different food and with the processing of different food, including the identification and evaluation of--

- (1) the severity of the potential health risks;
- (2) the sources of potentially hazardous contamination or practices extending from the farm or ranch to the consumer that may increase the risk of food-borne illness;
- (3) the potential for persistence, multiplication, or concentration of naturally occurring or added contaminants in food;
- (4) the potential for hazardous contamination to have cumulative toxic effects, multigenerational effects, or effects on specific categories of consumers;**
- (5) opportunities across the food production, processing, distribution, and retail system to reduce potential health risks; and
- (6) opportunities for intentional contamination of food or food ingredients"

now earlier in the bill they refer to a few "specific categories of consumer" as babies, the old, or the infirmed, (I'm assuming here that "infirmed" encompasses the immuno-compromised.)

so if any two people in these groups are negatively affected by any "ingestion of a common food" that product, and anything in it becomes a potential "contaminant" subject to regulation or dis-allowance.

so if two AIDS patients drink raw milk from the local Amish farm, and get sick, everyone at the farm is now liable both civilly (crushing their livelihood) and criminally - punishable with up to five years in a non-mortal case, and ten in a case where someone were to die. Not only that, but then raw milk would be federally regulated (kind of like a controlled substance,) or outright outlawed.

This bill, as the author of the article above states, can mandate treatments for crops and livestock that it deems necessary to prevent contamination, such as mandating which products are acceptable to do so - I'm sure DOW lobbyists are squealing with delight for the prospects of the new toxic pesticides they're developing...

You may think that all this regulation and oversight may pertain solely to those who distribute food as a business, but no - **this pertains to your home garden**. There's a provision that demands:

"a comparison of the safety of commercial processing with the health hazards associated with food that is harvested for recreational or subsistence purposes and prepared noncommercially..."

[\[A woman in the EU has been charged for growing herbs.](#) Watch the video explaining about CODEX.]

so at some point in the near future, if you grow your own food, you may be required by law to spray it with round-up.

All in all, I haven't seen a more devastating attempt at infringement on an individual's personal way of life than the USA PATRIOT act. This must be stopped... at all costs.