

## Open Letter to the President of the Royal Society and GMO Scientists

### Serious questions about the independence of European Food Safety Authority GMO Panels and about the Royal Society Q&A on GM crops<sup>1</sup>

**Question 14:** How are GM Crops regulated?

**Answer 14:** by the European Food Safety Authority

I wrote to Bernhard Url, Executive Director of EFSA in February 2016: Glyphosate causes cancer and birth defects. Humans are being poisoned by thousands of untested and unmeasured chemicals<sup>2</sup> in which I asked him serious questions about the independence of EFSA Committees. He has not as yet replied.

Perhaps the President can ask the GM Scientists who are members of the Royal Society to answer these questions

**Why is there no CV for Prof Dr. Achim Gathmann, Vice-Chairman GMO Panel 2016-2018?**

Because he works for the [Federal Office of Consumer Protection and Food Safety \(BVL\), Berlin](#): the very office which, according to EFSA, declared glyphosate not to be carcinogenic. EFSA's science has also been firmly endorsed by Britain as can be seen by Lord Gardiner's reply in the House of Lords.

**Defra questioned in the House of Lords about Glyphosate and its support for EFSA: Written question - HL135**

To ask Her Majesty's Government whether they will place in the Library of the House the three unpublished industry studies of the safety of the herbicide glyphosate relied upon by the European Food Safety Authority when it reached its decision that glyphosate is not carcinogenic to humans, namely the 2001 study owned by the Israeli pesticides company ADAMA Agan Ltd *Carcinogenicity Study with Glyphosate technical in Swiss Albino Mice*, the 2009 study owned by the Australian pesticides company Nufarm *Glyphosate technical: Dietary Carcinogenicity Study in the Mouse*, and the 1997 study owned by the Japanese pesticides company Arysta Life Sciences *HR-001: 18 month Oral Oncogenicity Study in Mice*.

=====

Answered by: [Lord Gardiner of Kimble](#) Defra's spokesperson in HOL: Answered on: 03 June 2016

The European Food Safety Authority concluded that glyphosate is unlikely to pose a carcinogenic hazard in humans. This conclusion followed a very thorough consideration of a wide range of scientific data, including a number of studies on laboratory animals. The mouse carcinogenicity studies were performed by independent testing laboratories and comply with the applicable OECD test guideline and Good Laboratory Practice. Carcinogenicity studies in mice are among the many EU data requirements for pesticides, and help to establish whether or not an active substance in a pesticide has carcinogenic potential.

Under the regulatory system for pesticides, studies are not published because of the danger that data may be wrongly used to support other rival applications for authorisation. However, requests to view the documents can be submitted to the Health and Safety Executive's Chemicals Regulation Directorate and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://royalsociety.org/~media/policy/projects/gm-plants/gm-plant-q-and-a.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <http://tinyurl.com/j8gjht9n>

**In the 2012-2015 period, why are the Chairs of the EFSA Panel on Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) and genetically modified food and feed, <sup>3</sup> the Scientific Committee and Emerging Risks (SCER) <sup>4</sup> and Contaminants in the Food Chain (CONTAM) <sup>5</sup> all British?**

Was it part of the plan with industry on 26/06/2012 to facilitate getting GM crops into Britain?

Professor Joe Perry, Chairman GMO Panel, formerly worked at Rothamsted Research.

Professor Anthony Richard Hardy, Chairman of SCER, formerly worked for the Central Science Laboratory in York and ADAS, (the science arm of MAFF that recommended in 1980 the advice of a Monsanto scientist that farmers should spray glyphosate on crops pre-harvest.)

Dr Diane Benford, Chairman of CONTAM, currently works for the UK Food Standards Agency.

Prof Huw Jones is another member from Rothamsted Research on the GMO Panel.

**Examples of EFSA GMO Panel ‘adopting’ GM without considering environmental consequences**

*"The UK Competent Authority and Syngenta had applied for placing on the market of a GM, herbicide tolerant (glyphosate) maize GA21 for food and feed uses, import, processing and cultivation."* <sup>6</sup> It was adopted by the EFSA on 16 December 2011. Although the EFSA GMO Panel had said that there were no effects on human or animal health or the environment in the Abstract, in the full document, they admitted to the problems of reduction in farmland biodiversity, selection of weed communities and selection of glyphosate-resistant weeds, and destruction of food webs and the ecological functions they provide. Nevertheless, EFSA adopted it, but covered itself by saying *"The magnitude of these potential adverse environmental effects will depend on a series of factors including the specific herbicide and cultivation management applied at farm level, the crop rotation...etc.* and recommended *"case-specific monitoring."*

**EFSA GMO Panel adopted GM crops on the grounds that they were safe for human health and the environment**

This is despite the many papers that show that super weeds are massively destructive to the environment in the US <sup>7</sup> and that over a period of 30 years there has been uncontrolled spread and contamination globally by many Genetically-Engineered (GE) plants that are herbicide resistant.<sup>8</sup>

Prof Joe Perry: Registered conflicts of interest.<sup>9</sup> He retired as a Rothamsted employee in June 2006. Indeed, apart from his name and email address there was little to indicate that he had been there. He seems to have ‘disappeared’ to become ‘Rothamsted’s man in Europe.’ From July 2006 he was permanently employed on various GMO Committees, until he took over from Harry Kuiper in 2012 as Chairman of the GMO panel. Prof Perry states at the bottom of Page 2: *In terms of time, over 98% of my working time consists of advisory work as an expert on the GMO panel of EFSA, which is ongoing since 2006. For this I receive only expenses."*

**Why did the GMO Panel say that glyphosate and GM would not harm Lepidoptera species?**

In 2012 the Chairman of the GMO Panel was lead author of a paper in the *Journal of Applied Ecology* "Estimating the effects of Cry1F Bt-maize pollen on a non-target Lepidoptera, using a mathematical model of exposure."<sup>10</sup> "A 14-parameter mathematical model integrating small- and large-scale exposure was used to estimate the larval mortality of hypothetical species with a range of sensitivities, and under a range of simulated mitigation measures consisting of non-Bt maize strips of

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/gmo/gmomembers.htm>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/scer/scmembers.htm>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/contam/contammembers.htm>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2480.htm>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.enveurope.com/content/pdf/s12302-016-0070-0.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.testbiotech.org/sites/default/files/Testbiotech\\_Transgene\\_Escape.pdf](http://www.testbiotech.org/sites/default/files/Testbiotech_Transgene_Escape.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/gmo/gmomembers.htm>

<sup>10</sup> <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2011.02083.x/pdf>

*different widths placed around the field edge” Synthesis and applications. Mitigation measures of risks of Bt-maize to sensitive larvae of non-target lepidopteran species can be effective, but depend on host-plant densities which are in turn affected by weed-management regimes (sic).*

If you find this paper difficult to understand, then listen to Prof Perry explaining The Risks of GMOs to a Residential Conference of Christians in Science.<sup>11</sup> At the beginning of his recorded lecture<sup>12</sup> he says: “*I don’t know anything about the science of GMs.*” This becomes very clear as he struggles to explain it to a lay audience. If you fast forward to 20.27 min, he then tries to explain the risk to a non-target species of moth. He finally comes up with a recommended distance between a Bt crop and a theoretical Nature Reserve of 30 metres to mitigate the risks to a non-target unknown species of moth. EFSA claims that the GMO Panel is a Panel of Experts on GM.

### **The ‘new’ technique of mathematical modelling is fraudulent**

Mathematical modelling failed to predict the near extinction of the migrant Monarch butterfly. In February 2015 the US Center for Food Safety produced an 88-page Report: *Monarchs in peril: Herbicide-Resistant Crops and the decline of Monarch Butterflies in North America*.<sup>13</sup> “*Unlike many other weed killers, once absorbed it (glyphosate) is translocated (moved internally) to root tissue, where it kills milkweed at the root and so prevents regeneration. The increasingly common practice of growing Roundup Ready crops continuously on the same fields means that milkweed is exposed to glyphosate every year, with no opportunity to recover. In 1999, common milkweed was found in half of corn and soybean fields, but only 8% of them a decade later.*”

### **Uncontrolled spread of GE crops: Testbiotech Report on the spread of GE Oil Seed Rape<sup>14</sup>**

GE plants have been grown for 30 years and commercially for 20 years. This independent Report provides a global overview of the uncontrolled escape of GE oil seed rape (OSR) in various regions of the world (US, Canada, Japan, Australia, Switzerland and Germany). In Switzerland where no imports of GE OSR have been allowed since 2008: “*Transgenic OSR was able to survive along rail tracks for long periods because extensive glyphosate spraying of these areas offer them selective advantages.*” In Japan: “*plants that proved to be resistant to glyphosate or glufosinate were found at ports and along transportation routes to industry plants where OSR is processed.*”

### **Transgene Escape: Global atlas of uncontrolled spread of genetically engineered plants<sup>15</sup>**

This Report, also from Testbiotech (Germany), makes several recommendations. Most importantly, measures should be put in place immediately to stop any further uncontrolled spread of genetically engineered plants into the environment as far as possible. Comprehensive regulation should be established to strengthen the Precautionary Principle and the release of genetically engineered organisms should not be allowed if they cannot be retrieved.

### **Conflicts of interest not declared: GMO Panel Chairman is joint author of a Review with EFSA of spread of feral GM herbicide-tolerant OSR: “*concerns are not scientifically justified*”<sup>16</sup>**

This paper by the Chairman of the GMO panel and EFSA dismiss concerns of escape of GE organisms into the environment. It “*concludes that feral GM herbicide-tolerant oilseed rape in Europe should not be routinely managed, and certainly not in semi-natural habitats, as the benefits of such action would not outweigh the negative effects of management.*”

### **Why did EFSA conceal their own paper that discovered a hidden viral gene in GMO crops?**

---

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.cis.org.uk/conferences/past-conferences/residential-2012/>

<sup>12</sup> [http://www.cis.org.uk/upload/conferences/Residential2012/Joe\\_Perry.mp3](http://www.cis.org.uk/upload/conferences/Residential2012/Joe_Perry.mp3)

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/files/cfs-monarch-report\\_2-4-15\\_design\\_05341.pdf](http://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/files/cfs-monarch-report_2-4-15_design_05341.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> [www.testbiotech.de/node/891](http://www.testbiotech.de/node/891)

<sup>15</sup> [http://www.testbiotech.org/sites/default/files/Testbiotech\\_Transgene\\_Escape.pdf](http://www.testbiotech.org/sites/default/files/Testbiotech_Transgene_Escape.pdf)

<sup>16</sup> <http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/15307/1/N015307PP.pdf>

In January 2012 Prof Du Jardin, University of Liège, Belgium, a Vice-Chairman of the EFSA GMO Panel was the second author of a paper whose first author, Nancy Podevin an EFSA employee, found a hidden viral gene in GMO crops.<sup>17</sup> In fact, this paper isn't among Prof du Jardin's selected scientific publications on his Biography for EFSA. Is he anxious to avoid it being discussed? Or has he been threatened by industry? There are at least two independent scientists who have suggested that there are serious questions to be answered about human safety by those in Europe authorising GM. Jonathan Latham, PhD, Editor of *Independent Science News* has written a Synopsis and he and Allison Wilson have published a pdf.<sup>18</sup>

*Synopsis: "A scientific paper published in late 2012 shows that US and EU GMO regulators have for many years been inadvertently approving transgenic events containing an unsuspected viral gene. As a result, 54 different transgenic events commercialized internationally contain a substantial segment of the multifunctional Gene VI from Cauliflower Mosaic Virus (CaMV) within them. Among these are some of the most widely grown GMOs, including Roundup® Ready Soybean (40-3-2) and MON810 Maize. The oversight occurred because regulators failed to appreciate that Gene VI overlaps the commonly used CaMV 35S gene regulatory sequence.*

*The authors of the paper, working for the European Food Safety Authority, concluded that functions of Gene VI were potential sources of harmful consequences. They further concluded that, if expressed, the fragments of Gene VI are substantial enough for them to be functional (Podevin and du Jardin (2012) GM Crops and Food 3: 1-5).*

*This discovery has multiple ramifications for biotechnology. Foremost, there is the immediate question of GMO safety and whether the 54 events should be recalled, but secondly, the failure implicates regulators and the industry in a circle of mutual incompetence and complacency. The discovery will also strengthen the argument for GMO labelling: if regulators and industry cannot protect the public then why should they not be allowed to protect themselves?"*

In Norway, on 24/01/2013 GenØk<sup>19</sup> published a similar assessment at the request of the Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management.<sup>20</sup>

### **Why didn't EFSA report these papers (1) showing the presence of Bt toxin in pregnant women and their fetuses; and (2) Bt toxin was not broken down in digestion and had toxic effects on mice?**

Maternal and fetal exposure to pesticides associated to genetically modified foods in Eastern Townships of Quebec, Canada<sup>21</sup> showed the presence of glufosinate herbicide, its metabolite 3-methylphosphinicopropionic acid (3-MPPA) and Cry1Ab protein (a Bt toxin) in pregnant women, their fetuses and in non-pregnant women. Another study showed that Bt insecticidal toxins similar to those engineered into GM Bt crops were not broken down in digestion, as is claimed by the industry and regulators, but had toxic effects on the blood of mice.<sup>22</sup> Cytotoxicity was also demonstrated on human cells of Cry1Ab and Cry1Ac Bt insecticidal toxins alone, or with a glyphosate-based herbicide.<sup>23</sup>

### **Conflicts of interest in the Questions and Answers about GMOs in the Royal Society<sup>24</sup>**

<sup>17</sup> Possible consequences of the overlap between the CaMV 35S promoter regions in plant transformation vectors used and the viral gene VI in transgenic plants.

<http://blogg.slu.se/forskarsbloggen/files/2013/02/GMcrops2012-Podevin.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.independentsciencenews.org/commentaries/regulators-discover-a-hidden-viral-gene-in-commercial-gmo-crops/>

<sup>19</sup> GenØk – Centre for Biosafety is a non-commercial foundation located in the research environment at the University of Tromsø and Forskningsparken (the Science Park). GenØk's vision is safer use of biotechnologies.

<sup>20</sup> <http://genok.com/arkiv/723/>

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0890623811000566>

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.esciencecentral.org/journals/hematotoxicity-of-bacillus-thuringiensis-as-spore-crystal-strains-cry1aa-cry1ab-cry1ac-or-cry2aa-in-swiss-albino-mice-2329-8790.1000104.php?aid=11822>

<sup>23</sup> <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jat.2712/abstractn>

<sup>24</sup> <https://royalsociety.org/~media/policy/projects/gm-plants/gm-plant-q-and-a.pdf>

**Ms Fiona Fox**, who was cited as a reviewer of GMO Questions and Answers, is Director of the industry-funded Science Media Centre. She boasted that in 2012 the feeding study by Séralini and colleagues on GM maize and Roundup® went largely unreported in the British Media but was front page news in France. France is likely to ban glyphosate but Britain is fighting to retain it. Gilles-Eric Séralini went on to win Whistleblower of the Year award 2015 for his work: *“He was the first to publish animal test results demonstrating the toxic and carcinogenic properties of the most commonly used herbicide worldwide, the glyphosate-based “Roundup” by carrying out a two-year feeding test on rats. After the research was published, Prof Séralini was attacked by a vehement campaign by ‘interested circles’ from the chemical industry as well as the industry-financed British Science Media Centre.”*

A number of Royal Society members (including Prof Jonathan Jones) and members of Rothamsted Research were invited to make adverse comments on the Séralini study.

**Professor Jonathan Jones who has links with Monsanto<sup>25</sup> was also one of the authors of the Royal Societies Q & A and claims that glyphosate is not poisonous to mammals**

January 2012 I had emailed Prof Jones about Monsanto’s GM corn not being sold in France.

*Dear Rosemary*

***Glyphosate is not poisonous to mammals- it inhibits EPSP synthase, an enzyme that mammals lack because we obtain aromatic amino acids in our diet. Roundup the herbicide contains surfactants- basically soaps- the consumption of which is ill advised. Roundup is considerably less damaging to the environment than the herbicides it replaced, such as those made by American Cyanamid (now bankrupt).***

*France has elected to reject the judgement of the European Court that it has no right to block planting of an approved insect resistant maize variety containing MON810. Fortunately Spain and Portugal have not been so stupid and their farmers plant 100k hectares of GM maize which requires less insecticides to control corn borer. If the cost of deregulation of useful and benign GM traits were lower, there would be more competition for the MNCs from small companies and the public sector. Regards Jonathan”*

**This statement by Professor Jonathan Jones is wrong: glyphosate poisons humans in the same way as it poisons plants**

Humans and animals have exactly the same pathway as in plants; mammals can only absorb nutrients via the bacteria in their gut; the gut microbiome. The gut microbiome is the collective genome of organisms inhabiting our body.<sup>26</sup> Pesticide scientists and plant scientists have based their assessment of herbicides on complete ignorance of human physiology. UK public health experts and physicians in the Wellcome Trust and the Royal Society have failed to question the accuracy of the pesticide regulators’ risk-assessor’s knowledge.

**Los Angeles County is suing Monsanto for false advertising; it claims on its label precisely what Prof Jonathan Jones and the European Regulators said**

Nancy Swanson, Seattle GMO Examiner, 21 April 2015<sup>27</sup>

Extracts: *Today a class action lawsuit was filed in Los Angeles County, California against the Monsanto Corporation. The suit alleges that Monsanto is guilty of false advertising by claiming that glyphosate, the active ingredient in Roundup, targets an enzyme only found in plants and not in humans or animals. Monsanto makes this claim to support the contention that glyphosate is harmless to humans.*

---

<sup>25</sup> [http://powerbase.info/index.php/Jonathan\\_Jones](http://powerbase.info/index.php/Jonathan_Jones)

<sup>26</sup> <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v500/n7464/abs/nature12506.html>

<sup>27</sup> <http://www.examiner.com/article/monsanto-sued-los-angeles-county-for-false-advertising>

*In the lawsuit, the argument is made that the targeted enzyme, EPSP synthase, is found in the microbiota that reside in our intestines and therefore this enzyme is found in humans and animals. It is further stated in the lawsuit that there are many human and animal health problems associated with the disruption of our intestinal microbes.*

*“Because it kills-off our gut bacteria, glyphosate is linked to stomach and bowel problems, indigestion, ulcers, colitis, gluten intolerance, sleeplessness, lethargy, depression, Crohn's Disease, Celiac Disease, allergies, obesity, diabetes, infertility, liver disease, renal failure, autism, Alzheimer's, endocrine disruption,” and the WHO recently announced glyphosate is ‘probably carcinogenic.’*

**Prof Pamela Ronald UC Davis defender of genetically engineered (GE or GMO) crops was also a reviewer of the RS Q & A on GMO crops**

Can the scientific reputation of Pamela Ronald, public face of GMOs be salvaged?<sup>28</sup> Jonathan Latham PhD writes in *Independent Science News* 12 November 2013. “Professor Pamela Ronald is probably the scientist most widely known for publicly defending genetically engineered (GE or GMO) crops. However, her scientific research has become the central question in a controversy that may destroy both careers. In the last year Ronald's laboratory at UC Davis has retracted two scientific papers (Lee et al. 2009 and Han et al 2011) and other researchers have raised questions about a third (Danna et al 2011). The two retracted papers form the core of her research programme into how rice plants detect specific bacterial pathogens”...

**Kevin Folta, one of a Panel of Experts set up in 2012 to answer questions by the public about GM<sup>29</sup>**  
Question: “Is it true that GMOs could accumulate formaldehyde to toxic levels (or even at all)? I don't know much about 'systems biology' but [this article](#) claims some authority.”

Answer by Prof Folta: “The paper by Ayyadurai et al. has caused quite a stir, even though it is simply a computer prediction that fails to agree with reality... There has never been a legitimate case where high formaldehyde levels were reported. However, this poorly-written, borderline scientific work appears to be more fear politics than hard science.”

[Kevin Folta was lying on behalf of Monsanto; there are plenty of independent scientists including Ayyadurai et al that have reported the presence of formaldehyde in GM crops.]

**Academic fraud and corruption: University scientist, Prof Kevin Folta caught conspiring with Monsanto to manipulate public opinion on GMOs<sup>30</sup>**

Dave Murphy EcoWatch, September 12, 2015

*“Last weekend (September 2015), The New York Times released a stunning expose of how Monsanto and the biotech industry enlisted allegedly independent public university scientists in a deceptive campaign to lobby state legislators in Pennsylvania, interfere with ballot initiatives in Oregon and Colorado and paper over risks of high pesticide usage on the Hawaiian island of Kauai...”*

For background on how this current story originally broke, you have to go back to Aug. 6, when the international science journal *Nature* reported that more than 4,600 pages of emails from University of Florida plant scientist Kevin Folta<sup>31</sup> “reveal his close ties to the agriculture giant Monsanto ... and other biotechnology-industry interests” ...

---

<sup>28</sup> <https://www.independentsciencenews.org/news/can-the-scientific-reputation-of-pamela-ronald-public-face-of-gmos-be-salvaged/>

<sup>29</sup>

<http://www.senseaboutscience.org/news.php/289/a-one-stop-shop-for-plant-science-questions>

<sup>30</sup> <http://ecowatch.com/2015/09/12/scientists-conspire-monsanto-gmos/>

<sup>31</sup> <http://www.nature.com/news/gm-crop-opponents-expand-probe-into-ties-between-scientists-and-industry-1.18146>

### **Gross scientific misconduct: How GMO scientist Shane Morris lied about GM corn to engineer a fake consumer choice study<sup>32</sup>**

Monday, June 06, 2016 by: Jonathan Benson, staff writer.

"A study published in 2004 received an award from the *British Food Journal* (BFJ) as the "most outstanding paper" of the year has been exposed as a total fraud. Authored by biotech hack Shane Morris, the study, entitled *Agronomic and consumer considerations for Bt and conventional sweet-corn*, used deceptive and undisclosed methods to sway buyers toward genetically-modified (GM) sweet corn seeds, only to later claim that consumers voluntarily chose the "frankenseeds" over the natural ones. Known today as the "wormy corn" scandal, the original publishing of the paper back in 2003 was met with outrage after it was determined that Morris, who at the time was employed by the government agency Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, intentionally manipulated the views of his participants to achieve a predetermined study outcome. According to the public investigations group Powerbase, Morris and his co-authors posted whiteboard signage above natural sweet corn seed bins at a farm store that swayed farmers toward the GMO seeds."

### **Genetically Engineered Foods: The Biggest Fraud in the History of Science. Governments and leading scientific institutions have systematically misrepresented the facts about GMOs and the scientific research that casts doubt on their safety**

On 4 March 2015 the Organisation Beyond GM facilitated the Press Release of American public interest attorney Steven Druker's acclaimed new book, *Altered Genes, Twisted Truth How the Venture to Genetically Engineer Our Food Has Subverted Science, Corrupted Government and Systematically Deceived the Public.*

His book reveals how governments and leading scientific institutions have systematically misrepresented the facts about GMOs and the scientific research that casts doubt on their safety.<sup>33</sup> GM Watch reported: "The book features a foreword by the renowned primatologist Dame Jane Goodall, who will also speak at the conference, hailing it as "without doubt one of the most important books of the last 50 years."

*The book's revelations come at a crucial time when the UK is considering the commercial planting of GM crops following the European Parliament's decision to allow member states to opt out of the blockade that has barred them from the EU until now. Based on the evidence presented in the book, Druker and Goodall will assert that it would be foolhardy to push forward with a technology that is unacceptably risky and should never have been allowed on the market in the first place. The book is the result of more than 15 years of intensive research and investigation by Druker, who came to prominence for initiating a lawsuit against the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA).*

### **Steven Druker initiated a lawsuit against the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) that forced it to open its files on GM foods**

*Those files revealed that GM foods first achieved commercialisation in 1992 only because the FDA:*

- \* Covered up the extensive warnings of its own scientists about their dangers
- \* Lied about the facts
- \* And then violated federal food safety law by permitting these foods to be marketed without having been proven safe through standard testing

*"Druker's well-referenced book points out that if the FDA had actually heeded its own experts' advice, told the truth and obeyed the law, the GM food venture would have imploded and never gained traction anywhere."* There were extensive media resources<sup>34</sup> but the launch wasn't reported

---

<sup>32</sup> [http://www.naturalnews.com/054267\\_GMO\\_corn\\_fraudulent\\_study\\_wormy\\_scandal.html](http://www.naturalnews.com/054267_GMO_corn_fraudulent_study_wormy_scandal.html)

<sup>33</sup> <http://www.gmwatch.org/index.php/news/archive/2015-articles/15973>

<sup>34</sup> <http://beyond-gm.org/altered-genes-twisted-truth-media-resources/>

in the mainstream media. It is not surprising since members of eminent societies and some editors of scientific journals and philanthropists in the UK & US are supporting GM.<sup>35</sup>

### **Druker challenges UK Royal Society over misleading statements made about GM foods**

[Open Letter to the UK Royal Society can be read here.](#)<sup>36</sup>

Extracts: *“Because clarifying the facts about GM foods is crucial for developing an intelligent, science-based policy on the future of agriculture, and because the Royal Society has significantly contributed to the confusion that currently surrounds this issue, it is imperative that remedial action be promptly initiated. This is especially so considering that:*

- *The European Commission is about to approve substantial regulatory changes in regard to GM crops.*
- *The UK is seriously considering allowing them to be commercially planted.*
- *The Society and other proponents of GM foods have inculcated the widespread illusion that there is an overwhelming scientific consensus that the safety of these products has been established through rigorous testing...”*

*Unless you promptly take these steps, it will demonstrate that your commitment to promoting GM foods is stronger than your commitment to honoring the truth and upholding the integrity of science. FURTHER, whether or not you own up to your irresponsible actions and take the steps specified above, I challenge you to read my book and specifically list any inaccurate statements of fact that you find in it, accompanied by an explanation of why the statement is erroneous and a reference to the evidence that corroborates your assertion.”*

### **The Royal Society supports GM crops but refuses to have a rational debate about them**

Dr Brian John of GM-Free-Cymru wrote an Open Letter to the President of the Royal Society Sir Paul Nurse on 26/01/2011.<sup>37</sup> It was in response to a BBC Horizon programme in which Sir Paul examined some of the reasons why the public at large is profoundly sceptical about science and scientists with regard to global warming and GM. Dr John says: *“For more than a decade now, scientists working in the GM field have mounted vicious personal attacks (sometimes politically rather than scientifically motivated) upon serious scientists who have had the temerity to discover ‘uncomfortable things about GM crops and foods’. This trend started with the vitriolic treatment meted out (with the Royal Society in the vanguard) on Arpad Pusztai and Stanley Ewen a decade ago, and continued with the crucifixion of Ignacio Chapela and David Quist, Angelika Hilbeck, Maewan Ho, Judy Carman, Gilles-Eric Séralini, Andrés Carrasco, Manuela Malatesta, Christian Velot, Irina Ermakova and many others...”*

*You will be aware that there has never been a single piece of epidemiological research to back up the claims that GM foods are entirely safe to eat. Since the earliest days of the GM enterprise, the industry has set itself against such research, and governments, regulators and august bodies like the Royal Society have connived in this cunning little plan, allowing GM advocates like Julian Little (Bayer) to trot out this sort of nonsense: ‘two trillion meals containing GM ingredients have been consumed with no adverse health effects.’ As we all know, there are abundant animal feeding studies that show that GM components in the diet lead to physiological changes and cell damage. The American Academy of Environmental Medicine drew attention to studies that indicate “serious health risks associated with GM food consumption including infertility, immune dysregulation, accelerated aging, dysregulation of genes associated with cholesterol synthesis, insulin regulation, cell signalling, and protein formation, and changes in the liver, kidney, spleen and gastrointestinal*

---

<sup>35</sup> Royal Society, Wellcome Foundation, Bill & Melinda Gates, Lord David Sainsbury and the Gatsby Foundation, Rothamsted Research, John Innes Centre, Sainsbury Laboratory, Civil Servants from Defra, NFU, James Hutton Institute, BIS, Offices of Life Sciences, Centre for Food Security, Food Standards Agency, etc.

<sup>36</sup> [http://beyond-gm.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/DRUKER\\_OPEN-LETTER-TO-THE-ROYAL-SOCIETY\\_Final.pdf](http://beyond-gm.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/DRUKER_OPEN-LETTER-TO-THE-ROYAL-SOCIETY_Final.pdf)

<sup>37</sup> [http://www.gmfrecymru.org.uk/open\\_letters/Open\\_letter26Jan2011.html](http://www.gmfrecymru.org.uk/open_letters/Open_letter26Jan2011.html)



system". They concluded that: "There is more than a casual association between GM foods and adverse health effects. There is causation ..."

### **Steven Druker says that there has been silence following his challenge to the Royal Society**

"The Royal Society wants us to take its word that GM crops are safe and healthy", writes Steven Druker on June 2015 in *The Ecologist*.<sup>38</sup> "But it refuses to retract its errors, apologise to those whose reputations it has impugned, or enter into constructive debate on the issue. To restore its scientific integrity, it must abide by its own motto."

"Scientific truths are not merely asserted, nor are they created by the authority of the speaker, no matter how eminent. They must be firmly rooted in evidence and rational argument."

### **Druker talks about the Royal Society's preposterous pretensions**

"But neither he nor the Society have acknowledged the errors, or provided any reply to the allegations made. Instead, the misrepresentation of reality has been amplified. In response to [media inquiries about the challenge](#), here's the official statement that the institution provides:" "The Royal Society bases its views on evidence, evidence that has been closely scrutinized by people with expert knowledge and that has stood up to that scrutiny. Personal opinions and unsubstantiated anecdotes are unhelpful to having a rational public debate on science and the use of new technologies."

### **The Society dismissed one of the most rigorous studies yet performed on a GMO food**

"Nor has the Society faced up to the fact that it dispensed multiple misrepresentations, and otherwise behaved unethically, in order to discredit the solid, and unsettling, research conducted at the Rowett Institute under the direction of Dr. Arpad Pusztai, one of the world's foremost experts in food safety. That study<sup>39</sup> is still one of the most rigorous yet performed on a GM food, and it's still highly relevant because it controlled for the effects of the new foreign protein - which entails that the adverse results it registered were attributable to a broader feature of the genetic engineering process itself.

And that is why proponents of GM foods cannot abide it and have ardently attacked it - with the Royal Society leading the charge.

As documented in my letter, first the Society savaged the research without having seen the complete data, which prompted the editor of *The Lancet* to rebuke it for its "breath-taking impertinence." It then strove to prevent the research from being published. And after the research eventually was published in *The Lancet* despite the attacks, the Society continued to misleadingly malign it."

### **Royal Society's 'deafening silence' on GMOs**

Colin Todhunter wrote in *The Ecologist* on 03/06/2015:<sup>40</sup> "It is now three months since Steven Druker addressed the Royal Society in his open letter and 44 days since 20 April. There appears to have been no response from The Royal Society - and certainly not a public one - except for a brief and deliberately insulting statement issued today." (See the underlined statement above).

"The Royal Society is the preeminent scientific body within the UK that advises the government. It therefore has an obligation to the British public to provide a public response and 'put the record straight' on GMOs - not least because the current staunchly pro-GMO Cameron-led administration will likely sanction the planting of GM crops in England within the next couple of years, and the

---

38

[http://www.theecologist.org/blogs\\_and\\_comments/commentators/2921277/the\\_royal\\_societys\\_assault\\_on\\_the\\_science\\_of\\_gm\\_foods\\_must\\_cease.html](http://www.theecologist.org/blogs_and_comments/commentators/2921277/the_royal_societys_assault_on_the_science_of_gm_foods_must_cease.html)

<sup>39</sup> <http://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/lancet/PIIS0140673698058607.pdf>

40

[http://www.theecologist.org/blogs\\_and\\_comments/commentators/2893487/gmos\\_the\\_royal\\_societys\\_deafening\\_silence.html](http://www.theecologist.org/blogs_and_comments/commentators/2893487/gmos_the_royal_societys_deafening_silence.html)

*Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) deal could [open the floodgates to GM](#) foods appearing on the shelves of UK supermarkets.”*

The purpose of The Royal Society is, according to its website, to *"recognise, promote, and support excellence in science and to encourage the development and use of science for the benefit of humanity."*

**The former President of the Royal Society, Sir Paul Nurse, was President of the Rockefeller University in New York: and yes, the Rockefeller Foundation developed GM Crops**

Sir Paul Nurse was appointed to Rockefeller private University in 2003 and finished in 2010. *"After he assumes the Royal Society presidency, Nurse will maintain a laboratory on the Rockefeller campus and will have an on-going relationship with the university."*<sup>41</sup> The Rockefeller Foundation did the earliest research on GMOs and founded the science of 'molecular biology' that reduced the complexity of life to a single gene, which was not stable.<sup>42</sup>

**Safeguarding human health in the Anthropocene epoch: Report of the Rockefeller Foundation–Lancet Commission on planetary health (56 pages, with 23 authors)**

At least 10 of the authors were associated with the Rockefeller Foundation, although only one curriculum vitae acknowledged the fact. Sarah Whitmee was seconded to the Foundation to serve as lead author of the Report and member of the Foundation's secretariat. One author worked as an environmental health scientist in the Office of the Science Adviser at the United States Environmental Protection Agency and was lead author of a recent paper [Biodiversity loss affects global disease ecology](#), which made no mention of pesticides. Most of the remainder are eminent public health doctors. The Rockefeller Foundation funded the initial research on genetically modified organisms in the early 1940s and founded the science of molecular biology, a highly reductionist programme aimed at "understanding" life. The Rockefeller Foundation gives financial support to the global spread of GMO technology; and to research on the biofortification of crops, the introduction of nutrients into crops by genetic engineering techniques for the supposed benefit of third world countries.

**Safeguarding human health in the Anthropocene epoch: Report of the Rockefeller Foundation–Lancet Commission on planetary health<sup>43</sup>: no mention of pesticides**

The Rockefeller/Lancet Commission on Planetary Health never mentioned pesticides.

According to the Report, the key drivers of ecosystem change in the last 60 years were: *"Increases in the amounts of nitrogen and phosphorus entering the environment through agricultural fertiliser runoff and soil erosion."* This is what Defra said in 2011 the Synthesis of the UK National Ecosystem Assessment:<sup>44</sup> *"Major increases in fertiliser use, particularly nitrogen and phosphorus, have adversely affected aquatic ecosystems through runoff."*

The scientists who contributed to the 56-page RF /Lancet Commission Report failed to mention the serious threats of exposure to the most widespread chemicals in the global environment, glyphosate (an endocrine disruptor) and the systemic neonicotinoid insecticides. Neither of them is routinely measured in the environment by governments or their departments of agriculture. However, there is plenty of evidence that humans and the environment are completely saturated with chemicals.

**When discussing overpopulation, why were references to Prof Paul Ehrlich's work omitted from the RF/Lancet Commission Report?**

---

<sup>41</sup> <http://newswire.rockefeller.edu/2010/04/23/paul-nurse-to-resign-as-rockefeller-president-to-become-president-of-royal-society-of-london-in-december/>

<sup>42</sup> <http://www.globalresearch.ca/doomsday-seed-vault-in-the-arctic-2/23503>

<sup>43</sup> <http://www.thelancet.com/commissions/planetary-health>

<sup>44</sup> [file:///C:/Users/Rosemary/Downloads/uk\\_nea\\_synthesis\\_report.pdf](file:///C:/Users/Rosemary/Downloads/uk_nea_synthesis_report.pdf)

The Bing Professor of Population Studies in the Department of Biological Sciences at [Stanford University](#) and President of Stanford's Center for [Conservation Biology](#), Ehrlich has warned about overpopulation since his first book, the Population Bomb, hit the headlines in 1968.<sup>45</sup> Since then, he has written about this phenomenon in increasingly urgent terms.<sup>46,47</sup> Here are some apposite observations taken from these two works:

There have been increasing signs of great toxic peril for humanity and its life-support systems, with a growing threat from the release of hormone-disrupting chemicals that could even be shifting the human sex ratio and reducing sperm counts;

- Agriculture is a leading cause of losses of biodiversity and ecosystem services;
- An industrial agricultural revolution has created a technology-dependent global food system;
- *But* it has also created serious long-run vulnerabilities, especially in its dependence on stable climates, crop monocultures, industrially produced fertilizers and pesticides, petroleum, antibiotic feed supplements and rapid, efficient transportation;
- Farming is a principal source of global toxification, *pace* Rachel Carson;
- Soils are being degraded;
- “Growth can continue forever if it’s in service industries”, and “technological innovation will save us” are fables;
- Worship of “free” markets should be deprecated;
- Without significant pressure from the public demanding action, we fear there is little chance of changing course fast enough to forestall disaster;
- This will require developing mechanisms to force big corporations (including those in big agriculture and big pharma) to bear social responsibilities like the real individuals whose rights they legally want to assume;
- Adverse symptoms of exposure to synthetic chemicals are making some scientists increasingly nervous about effects on the human population;
- Elected officials and other leaders have almost no knowledge of science.

### **The Rockefeller Foundation supports GM crops and biofortification of crops**

On the initiative of Bill Gates, in May 2009 some of America’s richest people met to discuss ways of tackling a ‘disastrous’ environmental, social and industrial threat of overpopulation at the home of Sir Paul Nurse,<sup>48</sup> a British Nobel prize biochemist and President (elected in 2003) of the private Rockefeller University in Manhattan.<sup>49</sup> David Rockefeller Jr. hosted the meeting. These same individuals have met several times since to develop “a strategy in which population growth would be tackled...”<sup>50</sup>

The RF’s 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Agriculture website says:<sup>51</sup> *“Since the 1970s, the techniques pioneered by the RF have been criticized for their environmental impact, for their relationship with big agribusiness, and for failing to eliminate hunger completely.”* The RF also founded the ‘Green Revolution’. *“As one analyst put it, in effect, the Green Revolution was merely a chemical revolution. At no point could developing nations pay for the huge amounts of chemical fertilizers and pesticides.”*<sup>52</sup>

### **The Rockefeller Foundation contributed to the scandalous Golden Rice Project**

---

<sup>45</sup> Ehrlich, P. R. *The Population Bomb*. New York: Buccaneer Books (1968).

<sup>46</sup> <http://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.1000330>

<sup>47</sup> <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.short>

<sup>48</sup> There was some doubt as to whether he was present or not.

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/may/31/new-york-billionaire-philanthropists>

<sup>49</sup> <http://www.globalresearch.ca/billionaire-club-in-bid-to-curb-overpopulation/13736>

<sup>50</sup> <http://www.prophecynewswatch.com/2014/March20/202.html>

<sup>51</sup> <http://rockefeller100.org/exhibits/show/agriculture>

<sup>52</sup> <http://www.globalresearch.ca/doomsday-seed-vault-in-the-arctic-2/23503>

The RF financially supported biofortification of rice and the University of Ghent. De Steur *et al.* from Ghent wrote in 2015:<sup>53</sup> *"This month marks the 15th anniversary of the publication of pro-vitamin A-enriched 'Golden Rice'. As the crop still awaits regulatory approval, its developers have little reason to celebrate. Golden Rice is not alone in facing a political and regulatory blockade. Several other biofortified transgenic crops also await authorization."*

They were not the only ones to express anger. The former UK Environment Secretary Owen Paterson opined: *"Opponents of the development of a type of genetically modified (GM) rice enriched with vitamin A are 'wicked'.*<sup>54</sup> *It's just disgusting that little children are allowed to go blind and die because of a hang-up by a small number of people about this technology."*

The Environment Secretary had been sadly misled about the availability of Golden Rice. The paper has been withdrawn, despite a court injunction to reinstate it. The Institute of Science in Society (I-SIS) sardonically remarked *"This 'golden rice', not yet available, is already worth its weight in diamonds.*<sup>55</sup> The paper, a joint venture between Tufts University in Massachusetts and Chinese scientists: 'Golden Rice (GR) has been genetically engineered to be rich in  $\beta$ -carotene for use as a source of vitamin A' was published in the *American Journal of Nutrition* 2012.<sup>56</sup> *The project was funded from four sources of public finance totaling US\$100 million: the philanthropic Rockefeller Foundation, whose mission is to support scientific research that specifically benefits the poor... Many have commented on the absurdity of offering 'golden rice' as the cure for vitamin A deficiency when there are plenty of alternative, infinitely cheaper sources of vitamin A or pro-vitamin A, such as green vegetables and unpolished rice, that would be rich in other essential vitamins and minerals besides."* Golden Rice was illegally trialled on children by scientists in Tufts University<sup>57</sup> without the knowledge of the Chinese Government. *"Independent scientists claimed that the trials were in breach of the Nuremberg Code of Ethics brought in at the end of the Second World War to prevent any repetition of the experiments conducted by Nazi scientists including many on children."* Further, a detailed audit on the project by I-SIS<sup>58</sup> uncovered *"fundamental deficiencies"* from the scientific and social rationale to the science and technology involved. It was being promoted *"to salvage a morally as well as financially bankrupt agricultural biotech industry."*<sup>59</sup> Protests by independent scientists were such that the paper was retracted by the journal. *"Among other things, the journal says, they did not provide evidence that they had ethical approval for their experiments. The authors filed an injunction last year to stop the retraction, but were denied one by a Massachusetts court on 17 July."*<sup>60</sup> Adrian Dubock, Executive Secretary of the Golden Rice Humanitarian Board in Switzerland, says that a few months ago, a wealthy philanthropist—whose name he declined to share—offered to bankroll Tang's lawsuit. *"My understanding is that this person is very troubled by socially important issues that affect the disadvantaged."*<sup>61</sup>

### **Biofortification with zinc**

A modelling study of the global threat of increasing carbon dioxide levels on zinc in third world countries appeared in *The Lancet Global Health* on the same day as the RF/Lancet paper.<sup>62</sup> Bill and Melinda Gates funded the study. The author, Samuel Myers, who appears to be associated with the

<sup>53</sup> <http://www.nature.com/nbt/journal/v33/n1/full/nbt.3110.html?message-global=remove>

<sup>54</sup> <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-24515938>

<sup>55</sup> <http://www.i-sis.org.uk/rice.php>

<sup>56</sup> <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22854406>

<sup>57</sup> <http://www.i-sis.org.uk/SPUCTGM.php>

<sup>58</sup> Ho MW. The 'Golden Rice' – An Exercise in How Not to Do Science. TWN Biotechnology and Biosafety Series No. 6, Third World Network, Penang, 2002. <http://www.i-sis.org.uk/onlinestore/books.php#276>

<sup>59</sup> <http://www.i-sis.org.uk/goldenRiceScandal.php>

<sup>60</sup> [http://www.nature.com/news/the-week-in-science-31-july-6-august-2015-1.18120?WT.ec\\_id=NATURE-20150806&spMailingID=49256879&spUserID=MTg5MTg3OTcxMTES1&spJobID=740835078&spReportId=NzQwODM1MDc4S0](http://www.nature.com/news/the-week-in-science-31-july-6-august-2015-1.18120?WT.ec_id=NATURE-20150806&spMailingID=49256879&spUserID=MTg5MTg3OTcxMTES1&spJobID=740835078&spReportId=NzQwODM1MDc4S0)

<sup>61</sup> <http://news.sciencemag.org/asiapacific/2014/07/researcher-sues-block-retraction-golden-rice-paper>

<sup>62</sup> <http://environment.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/piis2214109x15000935.pdf>

RF concluded: “Such interventions might include zinc supplementation, fortification of staple foods with additional zinc, the application of zinc-containing fertilisers to crops, and the development and introduction of biofortified crop strains such as rice and wheat.”

The 5<sup>th</sup> Viscount Ridley was Chairman of Northern Rock 2004-2007, the first bank to fail. He was bailed out by tax-payers. He inherited his place in the House of Lords from his father.<sup>63</sup>

**Matt Ridley scientist, farmer, part-time journalist (aka 5<sup>th</sup> Viscount Ridley) wrote in the Times 18/05/2016 A time to embrace GM crops and reap the rewards.”<sup>64</sup>**

Viscount Ridley quoted the *National Academy for Sciences, Engineering and Medicine Report on GE Crops Experiences and Prospects*,<sup>65</sup> both claiming that GE crops need fewer pesticides. I found it hard to believe that so many experts on GE crops, in a 407 page Report, could possibly forget this paper by Benbrook on the massive increases in glyphosate use in Trends in glyphosate herbicide use in the United States and globally (2016) which states that, “Since 1974 in the U.S., over 1.6 billion kilograms of glyphosate active ingredient have been applied, or 19 % of estimated global use of glyphosate (8.6 billion kilograms). Globally, glyphosate use has risen almost 15-fold since so-called “Roundup® Ready,” genetically engineered glyphosate-tolerant crops were introduced in 1996. Two-thirds of the total volume of glyphosate applied in the U.S. from 1974 to 2014 has been sprayed in just the last 10 years”?<sup>66</sup>

**The Open Letter from America<sup>67</sup> was from 60 million American citizens to David Cameron (and the rest of the EU) warning them not to authorize GM crops. It confirmed the devastating effects on human health and the environment. GM is not about public good or feeding the hungry as lobbyists claimed, but about corporate control of the food system**  
It was delivered to 10 Downing Street on 11 November 2014.<sup>68</sup>

*“In our country, GM crops account for about half of harvested cropland. Around 94% of the soy, 93% of corn (maize) and 96% of cotton grown is GM. The UK and the rest of the EU have yet to adopt GM crops in the way that we have, but you are currently under tremendous pressure from governments, biotech lobbyists, and large corporations to adopt what we now regard as a failing agricultural technology...Studies of animals fed GM foods and/or glyphosate, however, show worrying trends including damage to vital organs like the liver and kidneys, damage to gut tissues and gut flora, immune system disruption, reproductive abnormalities, and even tumors.<sup>35</sup>...These scientific studies point to potentially serious human health problems that could not have been anticipated when our country first embraced GMOs, and yet they continue to be ignored by those who should be protecting us. Instead our regulators rely on outdated studies and other information funded and supplied by biotech companies that, not surprisingly, dismiss all health concerns.*

***Through our experience we have come to understand that the genetic engineering of food has never really been about public good, or feeding the hungry, or supporting our farmers. Nor is it about consumer choice. Instead it is about private, corporate control of the food system.***

***Americans are reaping the detrimental impacts of this risky and unproven agricultural technology. EU countries should take note: there are no benefits from GM crops great enough to offset these impacts. Officials who continue to ignore this fact are guilty of a gross dereliction of duty.”*** Most of the countries in the EU apart from Britain took that advice and opted out of GM

<sup>63</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Matt\\_Ridley](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Matt_Ridley)

<sup>64</sup> <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/edition/news/time-to-embrace-gm-crops-and-reap-the-rewards-tknzsgdc9>

<sup>65</sup> <https://www.sciencebasedmedicine.org/national-academy-of-sciences-report-on-gmos/> GE Crops

Experiences and Prospects 407 page report.

<sup>66</sup> <http://enveurope.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s12302-016-0070-0>

<sup>67</sup> [www.theletterfromamerica.org](http://www.theletterfromamerica.org)

<sup>68</sup> [https://twitter.com/beyond\\_gm/status/532224079605288960](https://twitter.com/beyond_gm/status/532224079605288960)

(including Scotland, Wales and Ireland). EFSA and the EU Commission ignored the letter and continued to authorise GM crops for food and feed.

**National Academy of Sciences: GE Crops Experiences and Prospects.<sup>69</sup> The above letter contradicts the Report of the National Academy of Sciences. There were three points which the Press and Viscount Ridley missed in their headlines which hailed the safety of GM crops**

- Why were no farmers invited except for two? Food and Water Watch said: “The NRC did not invite any of the thousands of U.S. farmers and countless international farmers who are critical of or opposed to GMOs — some of whom have suffered economic losses because of the technology. The NRC did not disclose that [the two farmers invited] both of these farmers also had served as paid advocates of industry, having previously received funding from Monsanto or a Monsanto-funded advocacy group.”<sup>70</sup>
- The Report claimed that fewer pesticides were used...but missed out the report by Benbrook on massively increased herbicide use that I pointed out above.
- The Report failed to mention the funding from the Corporations. Among other conflicts, Food & Water Watch found that the NRC (and its parent organization, the National Academy of Sciences): • takes millions of dollars in funding from biotechnology companies • invites sponsors like Monsanto to sit on high-level boards overseeing the NRC’s work • invites industry-aligned, pro-GMO scientists to author NRC reports • draws scientific conclusions based on industry science • operates at times as a private contractor for corporate research.

**The Amazing Glyphosate Revolt Grows<sup>71</sup>**

23.05.2016 Author: [F. William Engdahl](#)

...“What is amazing about the entire ongoing battle over glyphosate re-approval is that opposition and awareness that the EU Commission is willing by any means possible to bow to the chemical industry glyphosate weed-killer cartel and approve a probable carcinogen, is growing by leaps and bounds, and internationally. That awareness is in turn bring light to the very dark corners of the world of GMO itself, something that Bill Gates, David Rockefeller, Monsanto, Syngenta and friends are none too able to withstand.

To date the EU Commission has received a staggering 1.5 million citizen petitions demanding they not re-approve glyphosate. The opposition to EU Commission approval of glyphosate has taken on a self-expanding character and that has the agribusiness weed-killer cartel alarmed. The process is exposing to the general public, for the first time in such a clear manner, the degree of corruption in not only Brussels but also in the so-called scientific bodies that advise it on what is safe and what not.”

“It can be said that the Rockefeller Foundation’s funding of genetic manipulation, of genetics since World War II, as I document in my *Seeds of Destruction* book, is about eugenics or race purity as the Nazis practiced during the Third Reich. Little known is the fact that the Nazi eugenics, otherwise known as creation of the “Master Race,” was financed by...the Rockefeller Foundation. Monsanto has been in the orbit of Rockefeller core assets, now joined by Bill Gates, since World War I....

**The EU Commission feels that it should compromise on re-approval of glyphosate on 23/24 June 2016 in case Monsanto and other agrochemical corporations sue the Commission<sup>72</sup>**

However, Monsanto has finally been found guilty of gross negligence by selling poisonous PCBs to members of the public, some of whom died as a result.<sup>73</sup> The agrochemical and agricultural biotechnology giant has been forced to pay a total of \$46 million in damages to plaintiffs in the case.

<sup>69</sup> <https://www.sciencebasedmedicine.org/national-academy-of-sciences-report-on-gmos/>

<sup>70</sup> [http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/sites/default/files/ib\\_1605\\_nrcinfluence-final-web\\_0.pdf](http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/sites/default/files/ib_1605_nrcinfluence-final-web_0.pdf)

<sup>71</sup> <http://journal-neo.org/2016/05/23/the-amazing-glyphosate-revolt-grows/>

<sup>72</sup> <http://www.politico.eu/article/europes-weedkiller-wars-glyphosate-roundup-who-european-commission/>

<sup>73</sup> <http://yournewswire.com/monsanto-loses-lawsuit-pays-46-million-to-poisoned-victims/>

A St. Louis jury voted 10-2 in finding Monsanto, Pfizer, Solutia, and Pharmacia guilty in the selling of polychlorinated biphenyls, or PCBs, after the compound had been banned. Plaintiffs in this case — three of nearly 100 involved in litigation, some of whom died — said they developed non-Hodgkin lymphoma from exposure to PCBs. “This is the future,” plaintiff’s attorney Steven Kherkher told EcoWatch, explaining his law firm had to ‘pool resources’ to initiate the lawsuit. **“The only reason why this victory is rare is because no one has had the money to fight Monsanto.”** However, he added, mentioning his firm has around 1,000 plaintiffs surrounding PCBs, **“It’s not going to be rare anymore.”** Kherkher also explained as more cases against the company come to court, **“every judge allows us to acquire more and more information from Monsanto and discover their documents. There is a lot more information out there yet to be mined.”**

**On December 3<sup>rd</sup> 2015 it was announced that Monsanto, the US-based transnational corporation, will be put on trial in the International Criminal Court in The Hague for ecocide<sup>74</sup>**

PARIS – The Organic Consumers Association (OCA), IFOAM International Organics, Navdanya, Regeneration International (RI), and Millions Against Monsanto, joined by dozens of global food, farming and environmental justice groups announced today that they will put Monsanto, a US-based transnational corporation, on trial for crimes against nature and humanity, and ecocide, in The Hague, Netherlands, next year on World Food Day, October 16, 2016. This International Criminal Court, established in 2002 in The Hague, has determined that prosecuting ecocide as a criminal offense is the only way to guarantee the rights of humans to a healthy environment and the right of nature to be protected.

The tribunal’s website says, *“According to its critics, Monsanto is able to ignore the human and environmental damage caused by its products and maintain its devastating activities through a strategy of systemic concealment: by lobbying regulatory agencies and governments, by resorting to lying and corruption, by financing fraudulent scientific studies, by pressuring independent scientists, by manipulating the press and media, etc. The history of Monsanto would thereby constitute a textbook case of impunity, benefiting transnational corporations and their executives, whose activities contribute to climate and biosphere crises and threaten the safety of the planet.”*

In addition to Monsanto, the tribunal intends to mount a "best case" to denounce "all multinational companies which are driven by the profit motive and thereby threaten human health and the safety of the planet". The initiative is *“unique and unprecedented”*, says Marie-Monique Robin.<sup>75</sup>

**Why have the mainstream media in Britain, the US and Australia remained silent? Senior members of the UK press have meetings with George Osborne in which minutes are not taken<sup>76</sup>**

*“Rupert Murdoch and top News Corp bosses 'met ministers 10 times in a year'. Those meeting with George Osborne included Evgeny Lebedev, the owner of the Standard and Independent titles, Telegraph Media Group Chairman, Aidan Barclay, Telegraph Media Group Chief Executive, Murdoch MacLennan, Guardian Editor, Katharine Viner, and the Sun Editor, David Dinsmore. Treasury records show that Osborne held two ministerial meetings. Osborne, like other ministers, accepted the hospitality of a series of media executives, including senior News Corp bosses. It is understood that minutes are not expected to be taken during these encounters”.*

Was this an opportunity to warn off Editors from talking about pesticides corporations because they were contributing huge amounts to the economy? However, the ‘alternative press’ such as *Global Research* has a massive circulation of ordinary people who know about the corruption of the UK and US governments. Some of the press barons have been present at meetings of the Bilderberg Group.

---

<sup>74</sup> <http://www.monsanto-tribunal.org/>

<sup>75</sup> <http://gmwatch.org/news/latest-news/16576-international-lawyers-and-ngos-launch-tribunal-to-try-monsanto-for-ecocide>

<sup>76</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/media/2016/jan/24/george-osborne-meetings-media-rupert-murdoch-telegraph>

## The Bilderberg Group

For over 14 years, Daniel Estulin<sup>77</sup> has investigated and researched the far-reaching influence of the Bilderberg Group on business and finance, global politics, war and peace, and control of the world's resources and its money. He states that in 1954, *"the most powerful men in the world met for the first time"* in Oosterbeek, Netherlands, *"debated the future of the world, and decided to meet annually in secret. They called themselves the Bilderberg Group with a membership representing a who's who of world power elite. Founded by David Rockefeller, who is also a leading Bilderberger and Council on Foreign Relations Chairman Emeritus, organizations he continues to finance and support."*

In a review of Estulin's book (May 25 2014), Stephen Lendman wrote:<sup>78</sup> *"CBS and other media giants control everything we see, hear and read – through television, radio, newspapers, magazines, books, films, and large portions of the Internet. Their top officials and some journalists attend Bilderberg meetings – on condition they report nothing."* The list of participants for the last 15 years or so shows that the CEO of Syngenta attended regularly (as part of the UK delegation) and must be a core member.<sup>79</sup> He occupies a powerful position amongst the global elite and presumably shares Bilderberg's objectives of creating a New World Order with an all-powerful corporate-controlled, global government with no democracy, manufactured crises and perpetual wars.

On Bilderberger's wish list in 1954 was: *no middle class, only "rulers and servants (serfs)," "a zero-growth society" without prosperity or progress, only greater wealth and power for the rulers; absolute control of education to program the public mind and train those chosen for various roles; a global "welfare state where obedient slaves will be rewarded and non-conformists targeted for extermination."* The Bilderberger-Rockefeller scheme is to make their views *"so appealing (by camouflaging them) that they become public policy (and can) pressure world leaders into submitting to the 'needs of the Masters of the Universe.'* " The *"free world press"* is their instrument to disseminate *"agreed-upon propaganda."*

## Conflicts of interest in the UK: the founder of Syngenta was appointed Chairman of CRUK in 2010

Since November 2010 Michael Pragnell MA MBA has been the Chairman of Cancer Research UK (CRUK). He was the founder of Syngenta and CEO of Syngenta AG based in Switzerland (from its public listing in 2000 to the end of 2007).<sup>80</sup> He was Chairman of CropLife International from 2002 to 2005. Not surprisingly, *The Guardian* revealed on 30/05/2016 that Scientists funded by Cancer Research UK, who spend their lives hunting for cures for the disease, are among thousands of academics whose pensions are invested in the tobacco industry.<sup>81</sup>

The CRUK website said about pesticides as a cause of cancer: *"For now, the evidence is not strong enough to give us any clear answers. But for individual pesticides, the evidence was either too weak to come to a conclusion, or only strong enough to suggest a "possible" effect. The scientific evidence on pesticides and cancer is still uncertain and more research is needed in this area."*<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Daniel Estulin: The True Story of the Bilderberg Group 2009

<sup>78</sup> <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-true-story-of-the-bilderberg-group-and-what-they-may-be-planning-now/13808>

<sup>79</sup> <http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/bball.pdf>

<sup>80</sup> [http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/Michael\\_Pragnell](http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/Michael_Pragnell)

<sup>81</sup> [https://www.theguardian.com/business/2016/may/29/cancer-scientists-pensions-invested-in-tobacco-bat?utm\\_source=esp&utm\\_medium=Email&utm\\_campaign=GU+Today+main+NEW+H+categories&utm\\_term=174706&subid=5939743&CMP=EMCNEWEML661912](https://www.theguardian.com/business/2016/may/29/cancer-scientists-pensions-invested-in-tobacco-bat?utm_source=esp&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=GU+Today+main+NEW+H+categories&utm_term=174706&subid=5939743&CMP=EMCNEWEML661912)

<sup>82</sup> <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/cancer-info/healthyliving/cancercontroversies/pesticides/>



### **Who decided to substitute alcohol for glyphosate as the prime cause of human cancers?**

An article by Anne Gulland was published in the British Medical Journal on 9 April 2016<sup>83</sup> that reported a survey commissioned by Cancer Research UK: 'People lack awareness of link between alcohol and cancer.'

The Report produced by researchers at the University of Sheffield '*comes ahead of the consultation closing on how well new drinking guidelines proposed by the UK's Chief Medical Officers in January 2016, are communicated.*'<sup>84</sup>

*"Almost 90 per cent of people in England don't associate drinking alcohol with an increased risk of cancer" Alison Cox, Cancer Research UK's Director of Cancer Prevention. She said: "The link between alcohol and cancer is now well established, and it's not just heavy drinkers who are at risk. Drinking alcohol is linked to an increased risk of seven different cancers - liver, breast, bowel, mouth, throat, oesophageal (food pipe), laryngeal (voice box) - but when people were asked "which, if any, health conditions do you think can result from drinking too much alcohol?" just 13 per cent of adults mentioned cancer." Dr Penny Buykx, a senior research fellow at The University of Sheffield and lead-author of the report, said: "We've shown that public awareness of the increased cancer risk from drinking alcohol remains worryingly low. People link drinking and liver cancer, but most still don't realise that cancers including breast cancer, mouth and throat cancers and bowel cancer are also linked with alcohol, and that risks for some cancers go up even by drinking a small amount."*

### **The CMO England blames alcohol for liver damage and liver cancer**

Evidence of glyphosate residues and liver damage has been found in Danish dairy cattle fed GM soya and maize<sup>85</sup> and Séralini's rats. That is not due to alcohol but to glyphosate residues from farm animals being fed GM soya and GM maize. Grotesque birth defects in piglets in Denmark correlated with glyphosate residues in organs.<sup>86</sup>

### **Cancers in pets have increased similarly over that time: is that due to alcohol?**

The American Veterinary Medical Foundation notes that "*Cancer is the leading cause of death in older pets accounting for almost half of the deaths of pets over 10 years of age.*"

According to Samsel<sup>87</sup> mammary tumours are common in dogs and cats and the incidence is increasing. He analysed 9 brands of dog and cat food and found significant levels of glyphosate and AMPA in all of them. Séralini's group wrote a paper 'Laboratory Rodent Diets Contain Toxic Levels of Environmental Contaminants: Implications for Regulatory Tests'. *We describe the contamination with environmental pollutants of 13 laboratory rodent diets from 5 continents.*<sup>88</sup> This was criticised by the industry-funded UK Science Media Centre.<sup>89</sup>

### **In 2012, Séralini and his team in France published a 2-year rat feeding study of GMO maize and Roundup. Chronic hormone and sex dependent pathologies occurred; males developed tumours at 4 months and females at 7 months<sup>90</sup>**

<sup>83</sup> <http://www.bmj.com/content/353/bmj.i1881>

<sup>84</sup> <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/about-us/cancer-news/press-release/2016-04-01-9-in-10-dont-link-alcohol-and-cancer>

<sup>85</sup> Glyphosate in urine of cows in Denmark; metabolic changes in blood parameters including increased lipid profile marker cholesterol <http://dx.doi.org/10.4172/2161-0525.1000186> This is the first study showing the extent of the exposure to glyphosate of Danish dairy cattle and its impact on different blood parameters.

<sup>86</sup> <http://omicsonline.org/open-access/detection-of-glyphosate-in-malformed-piglets-2161-0525.1000230.pdf>

<sup>87</sup>

[https://www.academia.edu/17751562/Glyphosate\\_pathways\\_to\\_modern\\_diseases\\_IV\\_cancer\\_and\\_related\\_pathologies](https://www.academia.edu/17751562/Glyphosate_pathways_to_modern_diseases_IV_cancer_and_related_pathologies)

<sup>88</sup> <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0128429>

<sup>89</sup> <http://www.sciencemediacentre.org/expert-reaction-to-study-investigating-content-of-and-contaminants-in-laboratory-rodent-diets/>

<sup>90</sup> <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2012.08.005>

*“The health effects of a Roundup®-tolerant genetically modified maize (from 11% in the diet), cultivated with or without Roundup®, and Roundup® alone (from 0.1 ppb in water), were studied 2 years in rats. In females, all treated groups died 2–3 times more than controls, and more rapidly. This difference was visible in 3 male groups fed GMOs. All results were hormone and sex dependent, and the pathological profiles were comparable. Females developed large mammary tumours almost always more often than and before controls, the pituitary was the second most disabled organ; the sex hormonal balance was modified by GMO and Roundup® treatments. In treated males, liver congestions and necrosis were 2.5–5.5 times higher. This pathology was confirmed by optic and transmission electron microscopy. Marked and severe kidney nephropathies were also generally 1.3–2.3 greater. Males presented 4 times more large palpable tumors (kidney) than controls which occurred up to 600 days earlier. Biochemistry data confirmed very significant kidney chronic deficiencies; for all treatments and both sexes, 76% of the altered parameters were kidney related. These results can be explained by the non- linear endocrine-disrupting effects of Roundup®, but also by the overexpression of the transgene in the GMO and its metabolic consequences.”*

**Authors’ highlights:**

1. A Roundup®-tolerant maize and Roundup® provoked chronic hormone and sex dependent pathologies.
2. Female mortality was 2–3 times increased mostly due to large mammary tumours and disabled pituitary.
3. Males had liver congestions, necrosis, severe kidney nephropathies and large palpable tumours.
4. This may be due to an endocrine disruption linked to Roundup® and a new metabolism due to the transgene.
5. GMOs and formulated pesticides must be evaluated by long term studies to measure toxic effects.

**Further conflicts of interest in the UK: The UK Science Media Centre is funded by industry and hosted by the Wellcome Trust; in 2012 ‘experts’ and European Food Safety Authority scientists<sup>91</sup> said the conclusions of Séralini’s 2-year rat feeding study with GM maize (with or without Roundup®) caused tumours, liver and kidney damage were not supported by the data**

The SMC sponsors include AstraZeneca, BP, Coca-Cola, L’Oreal, Monsanto, Syngenta and Nature Publishing Group. The Centre provides a rapid ‘expert’ opinion for journalists. The Director Fiona Fox admits that it was set up in the wake of Dr Árpád Pusztai publishing his paper in 1999 which showed that rats fed on GM potatoes had stunted growth and a repressed immune system.<sup>92</sup> On 10 August 1998 in a Granada ‘World in Action’ broadcast<sup>93</sup> Dr Pusztai raised questions about the safety of GM food in the human diet on the basis of the study. The news flashed around the world. Professor Robert Orskov OBE who had worked at the Rowett Institute for 33 years was told that phone calls went from Monsanto, the American firm that produces 90% of the world’s GM food, to Clinton and then to Blair. “Clinton rang Blair and Blair rang James” (Professor James, Director of the Rowett Institute). “There is no doubt he was pushed by Blair to do something. It was damaging the relationship between the USA and the UK, because it was going to be a huge blow for Monsanto.” Dr Pusztai lost his job and his Laboratory in the Rowett Institute was closed down.

**Some scientists commenting on several Séralini studies for the SMC went out of their way to conceal their conflicts of interest: one even tried to conceal his identity: for example the Chairman of EFSA GMO Panel Joe Perry declared no conflicts of interest**

Professor Joe N. Perry, Visiting Professor of Biometry, University of Greenwich, said: “This paper appears to be based on the same data as Seralini’s previous 2012 paper, with no real new

<sup>91</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/press/news/121128>

<sup>92</sup> <http://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/lancet/PIIS0140673698058607.pdf>

<sup>93</sup> <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/149882.stm>

information and only minor rephrasing and a few new references. Therefore, **I doubt whether my conclusions would differ from those of the vast majority of independent members of the scientific community**, who concluded in 2012 that there was insufficient evidence to justify the claims of CRIIGEN and Giles-Eric Seralini. However, I do welcome Seralini's promise to publish his raw data and my hope is that all organisations involved in GM risk assessment will, wherever possible in the future, publish in full their raw data in the spirit of full transparency and openness."

Declared interests: None declared

In comments on the Seralini study investigating the contaminants in laboratory rodent diets,<sup>94</sup> some Science Media Centre's experts<sup>95</sup> once again failed to declare conflicts of interest.

Prof Maurice Moloney did not declare that he had been involved in the development of Roundup® Ready crops in Canada. He said: "The Institute's core benefaction is from Potash Corp (a fertilizer, not pesticide, company) and the taxpayers (Govt) of Saskatchewan".

Professor Boobis also commenting on the Seralini study failed to declare that he was Vice-President of the International Life Science Institute (ILSI) Europe. In 2012, the ILSI group took a \$500,000 (£344,234) donation from Monsanto and a \$528,500 donation from the industry group CropLife International,<sup>96</sup> which represents [Monsanto, Dow, Syngenta and others](#), according to [documents obtained by the US right to know campaign](#). May 9-13 2016 Prof Boobis chaired the UN's joint meeting on pesticides residues (JMPR) just days before a crucial EU vote on whether to relicence glyphosate, the key ingredient in Monsanto's Roundup® weed killer brand.<sup>97</sup> The Meeting concluded that glyphosate is unlikely to pose a carcinogenic risk to humans from exposure through the diet.<sup>98</sup> The following day, Arthur Neslen reported for the Guardian the conflicts of interest on the WHO/UN/JMPR Panel.<sup>99</sup>

### **How Roundup® poisoned my nature reserve**<sup>100</sup>

In March 2006, UK's Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) announced the closure of its wildlife research centres, a decision opposed by 99% of 1 327 stakeholders. Monks Wood centre, which hosted BBC's Spring Watch, pioneered work on DDT and pesticides in the 1960s, and more recently revealed how climate change is affecting wildlife, with spring arriving three weeks earlier. The research centres were also involved in assessing the impacts of GM (genetically modified) crops on wildlife, with findings contradicting industry claims that no harm would be caused. In response to that and to the unexplained disappearance of birds and invertebrates (such as bumblebees, honeybees and other pollinators), we set aside one acre of the field next to our house in South Wales to make a chemical-free nature reserve...In 2006 we had 143 species of moth; in 2016 we have virtually none. **Invertebrates are the canaries in the cage**; imagine what is happening to humans.

### **Many diseases in the UK and the US are spiralling out of control**

Diseases in the US and the UK are similar. In the US correlations between the diseases and applications of glyphosate are very high.<sup>101</sup> Hypertension; stroke; diabetes, incidence and prevalence; obesity; lipoprotein metabolism disorder; Alzheimer's; senile dementia; Parkinson's;

<sup>94</sup> <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0128429>

<sup>95</sup> <http://www.sciencemediacentre.org/expert-reaction-to-study-investigating-content-of-and-contaminants-in-laboratory-rodent-diets/>

<sup>96</sup> Michael Pragnell the present Chairman of Cancer Research UK was Chairman of the industry group CropLife International 2002-2005.

<sup>97</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/may/16/glyphosate-unlikely-to-pose-risk-to-humans-unwho-study-says>

<sup>98</sup> <http://www.who.int/foodsafety/jmprsummary2016.pdf?ua=1>

<sup>99</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/may/17/unwho-panel-in-conflict-of-interest-row-over-glyphosates-cancer-risk>

<sup>100</sup> [http://www.i-sis.org.uk/How\\_Roundup\\_Poisoned\\_My\\_Nature\\_Reserve.php](http://www.i-sis.org.uk/How_Roundup_Poisoned_My_Nature_Reserve.php)

<sup>101</sup> [http://www.organic-systems.org/journal/92/JOS\\_Volume-9\\_Number-2\\_Nov\\_2014-Swanson-et-al.pdf](http://www.organic-systems.org/journal/92/JOS_Volume-9_Number-2_Nov_2014-Swanson-et-al.pdf)

multiple sclerosis; autism; inflammatory bowel disease; intestinal infections; end-stage renal disease; acute kidney failure; cancers of the thyroid, liver, bladder, pancreas and kidney and myeloid leukaemia.

**Fast-spreading genetic mutations pose ecological risk: US science academies advise caution in experimenting with gene drives<sup>102</sup>**

But as molecular biology research on gene drives has surged forward, it has outpaced our understanding of their ecological consequences, says Heitman. Even a small, accidental release from a laboratory [holds the potential to spread around the globe](#): “After release into the environment, a gene drive knows no political boundaries,” the committee wrote.

**The Agrochemical Corporations and their paid lobbyists are controlling pesticides regulation**

Science, and in particular the Royal Society, thinks it has all the answers. Many GMO scientists have conflicts of interest. Gene drive, genetic modification and pesticides have outpaced their understanding of the ecological consequences.

Rosemary Mason MB, ChB, FRCA

14/06/2016

---

<sup>102</sup> [http://www.nature.com/news/fast-spreading-genetic-mutations-pose-ecological-risk-1.20053?WT.mc\\_id=TWT\\_NatureNews](http://www.nature.com/news/fast-spreading-genetic-mutations-pose-ecological-risk-1.20053?WT.mc_id=TWT_NatureNews)