



Dear MEP,

15<sup>th</sup>. January 2007

**Re: Resolution on Biotechnology: Prospects and Challenges for Agriculture in Europe (2006/2059 (INI))**

**Submission to Members of the European Parliament from The GM Free Wales Alliance - an alliance of the Farmers Union of Wales, the National Federation of Womens' Institutes - Wales, Friends of the Earth – Cymru, and GM Free Cymru.**

The GM Free Wales Alliance urges you to critically question the biotechnology resolution as we believe it promotes the agenda of the biotechnology industry and is not based on sound science. [1]

We would draw your attention to the enclosed document 'GM Science – more problems than solutions'. This gives information and independent scientific evidence which we feel will lead MEPs, representing the interests of the people of Europe and of future generations, to understand why this resolution should be rejected as it stands.

If you would like further information or input regarding these issues please contact [gmfreewalesalli@btopenworld.com](mailto:gmfrewalesalli@btopenworld.com)

Yours sincerely,

C.Samra, GM Free Cymru

On behalf of the GM Free Wales Alliance

The GM Free Wales Alliance consists of four organisations – the Farmers Union of Wales (FUW), the National Federation of Women's Institutes – Wales (NFWI), Friends of the Earth - Cymru (FOE) and GM Free Cymru, and is supported by many other organisations in Wales. We have been working together for some years to monitor scientific, agricultural, health, consumer and political developments concerning GM technology and to ensure that the Welsh assembly, and organisations and people throughout Wales are kept informed about these issues. We believe that the precautionary principle should be invoked and that GM crops should not be grown until much more is known about the risks involved.

[1] The ADAS paper and the EC biotech resolution reflect the views of the agri-biotech industry, and include false claims, misinformation, and disputed and unsourced data on the uptake of GMO crops published by the International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-Biotech Applications. This is funded by Bayer CropScience, Monsanto, Syngenta, Pioneer Hi-Bred and the BBSRC to promote GMO crops in the developing countries. See <http://www.gmwatch.org/profile1.asp?PrId=66>. See also the Friends of the Earth Europe report on Monsanto at [http://www.foeeurope.org/publications/2006/who\\_benefits\\_from\\_gm\\_crops\\_Jan\\_2006.pdf](http://www.foeeurope.org/publications/2006/who_benefits_from_gm_crops_Jan_2006.pdf)). The quoted ISAAA figures give the impression that GMO crops have been widely adopted outside the EU, whereas in reality they have only been planted on 2.6% of the world's agricultural area.

# GM Science -- more problems than solutions

Paper produced for the GM Free Wales Alliance – January 2007

At [www.gmfrecymru.org](http://www.gmfrecymru.org)

The biotechnology industry, and advocates within the EC and other institutions, claim that biotechnology in general, and the GM enterprise in particular, are soundly based upon good science and are therefore deserving of public trust and public funding support. It is also claimed that an expanded use of GM technology and an increased production of GM crops and foods will enhance the scientific status of the EU countries and also help to alleviate world hunger in the decades to come.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The history of the GM industry is punctuated with disasters which have cost taxpayers millions of dollars and euros, and the science used in the promotion of GM crops and foods is of very poor quality. The regulatory bodies in Europe have accepted the assurances of the GM industry and dismissed concerns raised by independent scientists, despite increasing numbers of scientific studies providing evidence about the dangers of GM technology.

Far from holding out the hope of "feeding the world", GM crops and foods are now seen to involve "corporate feudalism" and to be associated with a host of socio-economic problems. GM varieties are out-dated if not dangerous, and are sustained by hype and spin rather than by any real nutritional, environmental or health value. Developments in "marker assisted" breeding techniques are much more exciting and more promising. The biotechnology corporations know full well that their GM products will not gain public acceptance, and so they have embarked on a strategy of "contaminating by stealth". The EC is supporting this strategy by limiting liability and by promoting the possibility of coexistence without contamination.

Here are ten points which demonstrate how dangerous it will be for the EU to continue its promotion of GM science by adopting the resolution:

1. GM science has now become "advocacy science" in which there is no place for independent or critical research
2. Scientists who express doubts about GM varieties are vilified and marginalised. The strategy seems to be "shoot the messenger" as a substitute for examining the message or repeating the experiment. The list of serious scientists who have been victimised by bodies supportive of GM grows longer and longer; included on the list are Arpad Pusztai, Stanley Ewen, Manuela Malatesta, Irina Ermakova, Mae-wan Ho, Terje Traavik, Ignacio Chapela, Bela Darvas and Gilles-Eric Seralini. Some of these have had their academic careers destroyed simply because their discoveries led them to express concerns about the safety of GM crops and foods. This is a sad indictment of the manner in which science is now conducted, with corporate influence at a very dangerous level.  
[http://www.gmfrecymru.org/pivotal\\_papers/manipulation.htm](http://www.gmfrecymru.org/pivotal_papers/manipulation.htm)  
<http://www.gmfrecymru.org/documents.htm>  
<http://www.gmwatch.org/archive2.asp?arcid=1132>
3. Many of the scientific experiments used to justify GM consents are non-replicable. This is because the GM multinationals who own and patent seeds and DNA sequences will only

allow "approved" scientists to use them for research purposes. We are aware of a number of cases where materials have been supplied initially for research (including environmental and safety research) but have then

been withdrawn or refused as soon as the scientists involved have discovered worrying or unintended effects attributable to the GM materials. Thus, at exactly the time when verification/repeat experiments are required, research is shut off. This is a source of concern to science journal editors just as it is to independent scientists.

[http://www.gmfrecymru.org/pivotal\\_papers/manipulation.htm](http://www.gmfrecymru.org/pivotal_papers/manipulation.htm)

<http://www.gmwatch.org/archive2.asp?arcid=7221>

4. The GM industry has shown that it is incapable of preventing contamination and out-crossing. The list of contamination incidents grows longer by the day, and it is clear that the industry is pursuing a policy of deliberate contamination. GM maize, GM oilseed rape, GM soya and other GM varieties are associated with runaway contamination and out-crossing, and the EU policy of "coexistence" will do nothing to prevent it.

[http://www.gmfrecymru.org/news/Press\\_Notice15Nov2006.htm](http://www.gmfrecymru.org/news/Press_Notice15Nov2006.htm)

<http://www.gmwatch.org/archive2.asp?arcid=7356>

<http://www.gmwatch.org/archive2.asp?arcid=7352>

5. The GM corporations seek at all times to evade responsibility for contamination disasters. This has been seen in the Starlink incident, in the case of BT10 contamination and in the current case of LLRICE601. Bayer is now claiming that the contamination of US long-grain rice stocks was an act of God!

6. The GM corporations routinely use corruption in the pursuit of global domination of the seed and agricultural supply

<http://www.gmwatch.org/archive2.asp?arcid=6567>

<http://www.i-sis.org.uk/BT10DMA.php>

<http://www.gmwatch.org/archive2.asp?arcid=6039>

<http://allafrica.com/stories/200612060954.html>

7. Research on the health and safety effects of GM food is systematically avoided

[http://www.gmfrecymru.org/pivotal\\_papers/listofabstracts.htm](http://www.gmfrecymru.org/pivotal_papers/listofabstracts.htm)

<http://www.biosafety-info.net/article.php?>

aid=413&PHPSESSID=9ead902ad24879cf9111558dbeecfea1

8. The GM industry is obsessed with secrecy, and will not allow independent examinations of the stability and uniformity of their GM varieties

[http://www.gmfrecymru.org/pivotal\\_papers/monsanto.htm](http://www.gmfrecymru.org/pivotal_papers/monsanto.htm)

9. GM consents are aimed at appeasing the American administration and the WTO rather than at protecting the health of EC consumers

10. The regulatory system is designed to facilitate GM consents rather than to protect the consumer

[http://www.gmfrecymru.org/open\\_letters/Open\\_letter27Feb2006.htm](http://www.gmfrecymru.org/open_letters/Open_letter27Feb2006.htm)