

**SEABOARD CORPORATION SHAREHOLDER PROPOSAL
FOR AN INDEPENDENT DIRECTOR TO SERVE AS CHAIR OF THE BOARD**

RESOLVED: That the shareholders of Seaboard Corporation urge the board to take the necessary steps to require that an independent director who is not nor was formerly the chief executive of the company serve as chair of the board.

Supporting Statement:

The board's ability to scrutinize management plans may be reduced when the board chair is also the chief architect of the management plan in his or her capacity as chief executive officer. By requiring that the chair be an independent director, the board may be able to bring to bear more critical review of basic management plans. We at the Sierra Club believe such critical review is especially important at Seaboard Corporation because of its exposure to environmental and public health liability.

Shareholders are concerned that our company raises hogs using practices that typically involve routinely feeding antibiotics to healthy animals. There is growing concern in the scientific and medical community about the increasing resistance of bacteria to antibiotics that are medically important for humans. The Union of Concerned Scientists estimates that 70% of antibiotics in the U.S. are fed to healthy livestock to promote growth and to compensate for unsanitary conditions. Some antibiotics used in meat production are also used in human medicine. (Clinical Infectious Diseases, June 1, 2002)

We believe that consumers are becoming increasingly alarmed by widespread industry use of antibiotics. A nationwide survey by Synovate in spring 2003 showed that 74% of those polled – regardless of age, education, income level, and region – are concerned about the presence of antibiotics in meat production.

<http://www.organicconsumers.org/foodsafety/beef052903.cfm>

We believe that such consumer pressure has reached the management of our company's competitors. According to PBS Frontline, Tyson Foods, Perdue Farms and Foster Farms recently declared their intention to greatly reduce the amount of antibiotics fed to healthy chicken. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/meat/safe/> Whereas, "Fast food giant McDonalds has banned some U.S. meat suppliers from feeding livestock antibiotic growth promoters, following concerns about the drugs' impact on human health," and we believe that our company may be indirectly affected by that well-publicized development regarding antibiotic use in the meat industry, we believe that an independent director is better positioned to evaluate risks associated with environmental liability. <http://www.theage.com.au/articles/2003/06/19/1055828440561.html>

The Company incurs risk if its products are determined to be contaminated or cause illness or injury. This risk includes (1) cost of, and negative consumer reaction associated with, adverse publicity and product recalls; (2) exposure to related civil litigation; and (3) regulatory administrative penalties, which can include injunctive relief and other civil remedies, including plant closings.”

We believe that these environmental liabilities count as some of the more conspicuous, difficult challenges the board must oversee. We think that such a board should be led by someone distinctly independent of any plan and implementation to address these challenges.

Numerous scholars have called for greater distinction between directors and management.

For these reasons, we urge you to vote FOR this proposal.