

Comments from the public: MIR604xGA21 maize

Organisation: private

Country: Sweden

Type: Individual

a. Assessment:

5. Others

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jeffrey-smith/genetically-modified-soy_b_544575.html

6. Labelling proposal

Please reject this application on insect-protected and herbicide tolerant genetically modified maize MIR604xGA21 for food and feed.

Organisation: Microbiologist

Country: Sweden

Type: Individual

a. Assessment:

Molecular characterisation

The genetically modification to give back genes to seeds and other breded crops is a very good target. This gene modification I strongly recommend As it is a fast way to improve the crops.

But I am very negative to the combination of giving a natural gene together with a new one especially as this new gene is a target of Syngenta to give the seeds their own herbicide business advantage.

Comparative analysis (for compositional analysis and agronomic traits and GM phenotype)

-

**b. Food Safety Assessment:
Toxicology**

Herbicides are always negative to all cells even human cells. As they can be irritating on the skin it must be even worse if the food is contaminated with this herbicide. If the crop is soaked with the herbicide this will occur. A genetic modification to better tolerance to a specific herbicide makes the natural sensitivity disappear.

Allergenicity

See above, the same reason too much of the herbicide within the crops (food) will give an allergic response above natural levels.

Nutritional assessment

-

Others

I am very interested in molecular biology and I have been studying both animal cells and plant cells at the University of Uppsala.

3. Environmental risk assessment

If herbicides are used in overdose which is at large risks if the crop is non-sensitive to it then the normal flora will be disturbed as the herbicide will not disappear from earth at once.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

Do not approve this gene modification with twisted herbicide and natural genes. Force the company to do it separately, and this is possible to do!

5. Others

-

6. Labelling proposal

On the label it must be told if herbicide genes are inserted in the crops. No natural genes do need this information.

Organisation: Uppsala University

Country: Sweden

Type: Individual

a. Assessment:

Allergenicity

The reason of sharply increased allergies and related oversensitivity in Western societies is poorly understood. There are evidence of genetically modified plants causing allergies, e.g. potato. Until further knowledge is obtained, accepting genetically modified plants such as maize cannot be recommended.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

Supported by the precautionary principle, genetically modified plants such as maize should not be accepted because of lack of knowledge of its possible consequences on allergy and environment.

6. Labelling proposal

In case of eventual permission to handle genetically modified maize, it should be clearly labelled at all levels of handling and trackable to source of origin.

Organisation: Private Researcher

Country: France

Type: Individual

**a. Assessment:
Molecular characterisation**

Bt technology known to induce fatal bleeding disorders in farm animals as quickly as 2 days after feeding.

Bt method of killing target insects originally thought to be inducing starvation.

By 2006 accepted that it destroyed the guts of insects by poking holes in them. This is the cause of death to the USA bee population where we are officially not sure of the cause of their demise suddenly after hundreds of thousands of years safe life on this planet. Today we import bees to pollinate fruit. GMO foods mostly rely on wind not bees so their death is of no concern to GMO developers of grain crops. Pollen not collected means that the levels are reaching higher levels year on year.

Comparative analysis (for compositional analysis and agronomic traits and GM phenotype)

Although conventional development the original plants are GMO using Bt technology which carries over to this new strain. Many of the original GMO varieties are now withdrawn for whatever reason.

**b. Food Safety Assessment:
Toxicology**

No safety data submitted to your panel to my knowledge.

No safety checking will be carried out after approval.

The actual safety checks resemble that of thalidomide. We may find out if we are lucky of any good or bad effects.

Is there even any comparisons of taste. New formulations of maize products of whatever origin have been consigned to the dustbin as too disgusting to eat. These may in fact be non GMO but it is too expensive to check and for what reason by me.

Animals around the world have died after eating food with this Bt technology and the hiding away from view of such illness and death plus comparing Bt proteins eaten as part of the food with insects used in organic culture but not eaten afterwards or in the food makes the comparison completely false.

Allergenicity

Peanuts provides a model of allergenicity but no university or government admitting GMO

alteration of the peanut but therefore no proven origin of a new and fatal allergy to very few people. Providing the rational that enough people can survive eating any poisonous food and those that become ill or die there will be no absolute proof of cause ever.

Nutritional assessment

To my knowledge not a single tasting test has been done on this product. It may be as nutritious, more nutritious or less so but we don't know. As value for money we know the price of GMO food has gone up more than twice the rate of conventional food causing less nutrition per dollar or euro than five years ago.

Others

UK application for GMO maize – The UK have a track record of supporting GMO in the face of science telling us of harm to our liver and kidney and other organs. Professor Arpad Pustzai found GMO potatoes harmful and was immediately removed from his place of work by the UK government. This same Socialist government now voted out of office this year are responsible for the current application for Syngenta maize. Recently two members of the UK regulatory panel resigned giving reasons that GMO products were being approved regardless of any science for or against them.

Syngenta the company wanting approval for their GMO maize are a chemical company and have for example allowed the « safe » use of an organophosphate called diazinon until by mutual agreement with USA regulators (EPA) in 2000 they stopped the world production with a four year withdrawal from market. Today in 2010 the use of this chemical is again on the increase despite their assurance and promise of 2000. The reason agreed then was that it was not possible for Syngenta (then Novartis) to produce a bag to contain the chemical. Nancy Sokol Green in her book explains how more than 20 doctors failed to diagnose harm from diazinon to her health. Back 40 years ago, diazinon was cleared of harming 60 per cent of the Australian workers using it who developed a dangerous permanent nervous system disorder. The proof of harm even from a chemical designed to kill every other species than man is almost impossible to the degree required in law. The partial destruction of the UK cattle industry matched to a day the introduction nationwide of sheep dips using this chemical which was then at times put on the pasture that cattle eat. The change over from organochlorine chemicals to diazinon occurred overnight with the first BSE cows almost immediately after if not a few days before from large farms pre trials of the new chemical. There is absolutely no doubt that cattle are many times more sensitive to diazinon than sheep. An industry that cannot control the safety or production of diazinon they themselves disowned are now assuring us that their new enterprise of maize GMO seed production is safe. Maize was a safe food for hundreds of thousands of years but today the safety is not being shown to us and independent testing of the seed is ILLEGAL. GMO maize today does harm animals and humans. Every seed company has fallen prey to the chemical industry and the loss of seed to those less able to guard them sensibly is serious for us.

The European committee has the responsibility for the safety of 300 million members of our community. A dozen or so people cannot with conscience allow this addition to our food tables of a product that is designed to kill many insects but not the people that eat it

afterwards. The nervous system of an insect is 95 per cent the same as the human nervous system. So how accurate are those assurances of safety not even backed up by science on their part. A simple query of the GMO harm to sheep in India was met with « We haven't tested the GMO product on any sheep ever in our trials of GMO ». GMO has been around since 1972 with massive plantings in the USA in 1996. How was the safety of these products determined back then? The mechanism of harm of Bt to insects was only found out in 2006 or to be honest the currently accepted path to harm and death. The same mechanism as found in dead bees in USA for which we claim no knowledge of what is responsible for their death. How do we know and trust this mechanism if the previous mechanism has been found wanting. How can we accept assurances that destruction of the gut and bleeding to death will not carry over to humans in this form or in other ways? Something is certainly killing the bees and also there are reports of mass deaths to mammals such as the bats in addition to NEW illnesses to farm animals many of which are largely UNKNOWN and impossible to discuss with vets. We have proof of IGNORANCE and proof of NON TESTING of the GMO products but we expect a panel to accept this GMO derived product because it has been passed as safe. It has NEVER been proven safe just passed as safe because interested people tell us it is safe. A declining health in the population that eats it is just ignored. USA 44 per cent obese – blamed on LACK of EXERCISE. War prisoners never had exercise and never were FAT the state before OBESITY. Food or lack of it caused thinness in prisoners. GMO food and its abundance MAY play a part in the current OBESITY now slowly arriving in Europe. What are the advantages to the customer of GMO toxic to insects food? Is the maize better tasting? Does it produce more to the hectare? Is it cheaper? Most important is it safe? Not proven so. Only proven harmful. The only noted advantage of GMO maize is that it resists more and more toxic chemicals produced as the primary business of this company. The old committee has done stalwart work in providing the single continent that has some sort of control over the mass planting of GMO crops and the feeding of GMO to its people. The new committee has passed or is in the process of passing GMO products with no science to back up the application, no checking afterwards and no reason why the new product will benefit the consumer with cheaper food, better food or more nourishing food. There are no improvements to be gained from GMO maize and not just a theoretical risk but proven risk of harm to people often denied by refusing publication and sacking and dishonouring those people of integrity. This year Professor Séralini and other people specifically showing harm from GMO maize are under sustained attack such that calls for support for him are asked for. I personally hold every member of the committee directly accountable for their actions in passing or failing GMO maize for our consumption. There is no evidence of safety in the safety other than the statement of « IT IS SAFE », none demanded by your panel and the application should be complete not demanding some things permitted for this product and others denied. The contamination of starlink corn directly as a result of split decisions allowing use for animals but not humans. Here we have the split decision of permitting imports of a dangerous foodstuff but not the planting of the same food. Bizarre. In the manner of errors reflected no better than in the transnational BP we see human error must always be allowed for. Why are we passing a stupid ruling of allowance of a product but not the growing of the same product? If one person in your committee cannot approve on his own the application for a toxic plant known at least to be toxic to insects to the point of death and be certain it can't have a negative health effect on other forms of life then they cannot be part of a committee that accepts the feeding of 300 million people with toxic food. That person would be guilty of the damage to the health of many people. The others can claim ignorance of known harm but cannot be excused for not demanding FULL disclosures of safety done on this product they will nod through to the detriment of those people who rely on them for their very safety and health. We are already subjected to toxic chemicals by these companies for which they also deny harm

but which can now be measured in our bodies. Why don't we die from toxic insult? Simply because of the ability of the body to recover. Why do we need to recover from harmful GMO maize harm when it is simpler to use and develop varieties chosen for nourishment and taste and not for their destructive effect on life forms. We have no earthly reason to change the maize from that already developed by conventional development ONLY.

Maize has been grown for generations and the yields sufficient for our needs. In the past 5 years food prices have risen around to twice the previous level with many people on the same or lower salaries. GMO food has risen in line and for some it has risen 5 times the old price in this time. The economic reason of providing food for the poor is clearly not true. Today for whatever reason the poor are not only less likely to afford their food but may not be helped if they eat GMO maize which for insects spells death by destruction of their guts and by bleeding if animals. In India, sheep died from a mysterious new illness but only from sheep eating GMO products and not from old non GMO varieties. The news of such deaths kept out of public eyes until last year, many years after the strange illnesses were first discovered. In USA prisons, « experiments » are being carried out where prisoners are fed GMO maize. The results not published indicate many need operations to repair damaged and leaky guts. Starving nations have refused GMO food and eventually accepted it under strong protests. GMO knowledge and concern for their health is growing even among the starving nations. Simply if people want non GMO then why are we to be denied this simple thing? In countries permitting GMO it is impossible to segregate the products and yet with varieties of apples etc it seems not to be a problem?

This application does not include permission to grow the crop in Europe. It is therefore a partial approval but will be misconstrued by the less informed as just an approval of GMO maize alongside the now accepted GMO potato. It is in fact approval by any means you look at it. Approval to eat the same proteins that make animals from England to India die from bleeding disorders and for prisoners in the USA to need reparative gut surgery to maintain life. Do we need such food aptly called FRANKEN foods here in Europe? Are the conventional never genetically altered by man maizes not sufficient? The methods used to increase total yields include the appropriation of new land not made deficient by chemical treatments and leading to the accelerated decline of the small farmer who cannot afford to buy GMO seed and often poisoned by larger farms encroaching and polluting his own land and animals.

This application uses GMO maize now conventionally improved but from GMO predecessors but in what way as already asked? Are there any benefits shown in the application? Are there any safety evaluations in the application or are we to accept that the maize is safe because other people say it is safe? Are there going to be any checks on those that eat this to see if there are adverse effects after two days as in India for the sheep that die? This application would appear to be asking for approval on no grounds of science, on no grounds of safety and on no grounds of a benefit to the consumer. It would appear to be for the benefit of using toxic chemicals on virgin lands, to be of benefit to the big landowners who will destroy the livelihood of small farmers and pollute the crops of organic farmers.

Approval or no approval the GMO breeds have infiltrated to the extent of 0.1 per cent in short time and now we see this pollution increase again tenfold. The mixing of GMO with the same and other plants is a fact of nature and cannot be stopped. Whether or not approved we can expect the pollution of GMO to continue. We can also expect the health of the nations to follow that of the USA. Once the healthiest in the world with the least deaths to its new born. Today not only has this slipped behind all the European nations but nervous disorders run at

one child in three with ten times as many autistic children than in Europe. We are in an Alice in Wonderland situation where we have to accept GMO maize because the alternative is to admit our food is toxic for us and has been for many years due to infiltration into organic food and rising ten fold in a few years. In France where water is contaminated and unfit to eat the term used is that the water is SAFE by DEROGATION. We seem to have reached the level where we are being fed GMO harmful maize but told it is safe to eat also by DEROGATION. This is not acceptable. When the health of Europe becomes worse who will accept that GMO maize plays a part in the increase of illness? Has anyone done tasting checks on these foods. After eating maize products in crisps, chips etc I find some today have a diabolic taste sufficient to reject them and throw them away. Is this a good method to feed the world if new foods taste so disgusting? And should we now have to be suspicious of what we eat as in Chernobyl where a friend visited and used a Geiger counter before eating his meals. What is the world descending to in the wake of so many advancements in computing technology. In the food science we are actually going backwards where people becoming ill have paid large sums to check the safety of a meal costing a few euros and finding GMO contamination but no acceptance their health is due to that polluted food ILLEGAL now but LEGAL on the passing of your APPROVAL. Tomorrow these people will become ILL, can test and find GMO but the answer will come back – IT IS SAFE. Your committee will be RESPONSIBLE.

The majority of plants are not edible and the toxifying of once edible plants has led to health problems of an increasing nature. Peanuts once edible can now kill people and although there is no definite proof of a GMO alteration, any university or government laboratory could today or yesterday quietly work on these plants without knowledge to anyone else. It is difficult to conclusively find any living thing not GMO experimented upon. A recent experiment on mice actually killed every mouse although the proposed insertion was to reduce their breeding ability. Unless this group chose to reveal the results we would be ignorant of this one piece in millions of other experiments. It is true to say that every GMO innovation has proved a disaster with most of the approved GMO food plants now superseded for whatever reason. The need for continuing technology to maintain a war effort in bio warfare is disgusting but necessary maybe but do we have to pay the price in peace time too?

My own health suffered severely on several occasions in recent years due to mysterious and disturbing bleeding which on reflection can be due to eating Bt food already released onto the European market. I am certain in my mind that bad food is the cause of this distressing condition now halted for three years but coming on at the same time of the year one year after the other after the harvest in autumn.

50 laboratories in Europe are the only ones that can check the food coming into 300 plus million people and the cost of testing for GMO is so high that often the first alarm is raised not by these laboratories but by people like myself with money to get their food checked. The only result so far is to regulate upwards the amount of GMO food allowed before it can be called GMO. So today we are in the position of harm from less than 1 per cent contamination with requested approval for us to receive by chance up to 100 per cent contamination of normal maize with GMO maize containing proteins lethal to some insects but by assurance from people not aware of the action of this protein more than ten years after its introduction that it has no action to harm us. Bizarre.

Again I ask where are the safety tests in the submission? I want to see them. And where is the concern for what the panel will approve when the GMO hits the market place and is eaten. No checking is asked for or required. Not looking for any change of health is IMMORAL, UNETHICAL and CRIMINAL.

UK, the applicant for this product have a parliament with a canteen that is reputed to source all the food to ensure NO GMO food is eaten by those politicians that tell us the GMO food is the same as ordinary food and harmless to eat. So why source Non GMO foods therefore? NIMBY behaviour. Everyone else must eat it but not us.

Finally on a housekeeping note I feel the near 30 000 euros each month paid to some committee members is disproportionately high and will ensure that the money to some will cause them to accept approval of a dangerous foodstuff where refusal might shorten their length of employment as per Professor Pustzai so shamefully dismissed after his harm found for a GMO potato similar no doubt to that now newly approved by your committee. I have looked through the interests declared and while many seem thorough and complete some seem incomplete and very poorly written out. I hope this is not repeated in their examination of what is known harmful product affirmed safe on the basis of no safety information or follow up when approved by your committee. I also am rather surprised how a new panel can approve a GMO harmful potato when in office for a few days only?

How much is taken into account of mixing animals with plants, viruses with bacteria, antibiotics and proteins? Are the coding systems for DNA, RNA in all these the same? And if not are we not playing god and or more accurately being the DEVIL? Soya the food of those that hated animal methods of farming now see that GMO soya is admitted to be harmful in more than a dozen ways it harms people with the lame excuse it was always harmful. There is again no dispute that GMO soya is indeed a food to be used very sparingly because of all its NEGATIVE effects on human biochemical enzyme systems. I feel maize will rapidly be found to be bad for us even if we resist GMO in Europe as like AIDS, once in the wild there is great difficulty in stopping its advance. AIDS the committee will be aware is a retro virus. Paul Berg used a retro virus as it had no known illnesses in man. Today a retrovirus is the biggest killer of man from infection. The relation of AIDS to GMO technology is so close that no one who is the world expert on these matters wants to know the TRUE ORIGIN of AIDS.

My own private research into health and safety issues for more than 15 years still goes unpaid, largely unwanted and totally ignored to date. I have to say that despite this the gaps in my knowledge are huge and find it impossible to believe your committee or any committee can safely check through the ramifications of this new technology especially on the basis of just accepting a word of those interested and the knowledge of completely new information of huge health concerns being found more than ten years into growing of such products and dismissing the harm found.

We need to say NO to syngenta. The question is are we politically able to say no to a known harmful food or do we need to sacrifice 300 million people to their ILL HEALTH?

3. Environmental risk assessment

Limited as the application does not require planting in Europe. But in time this must be assumed will be passed and the safety tests etc necessary for this may be waived away. The proposal is a thinly disguised way of avoiding too close a view of the good or bad effects of this new food stuff.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

The feeding of 300 million people with a technology not proven to be safe and the mechanisms possibly understood for the first time in 2006 make this product effectively a medicine that will be forced upon a population largely against it. GMO vaccines for H1N1 flu were refused by 95 per cent of the French population and there is every reason to suspect more than 50 per cent do not want GMO food. Jose Bovy went to prison for cutting down GMO maize in France and got 1 per cent of the vote for presidency. His party now claims 12 to 20 per cent of the vote for a political party with no politics other than a conviction based on science or lack of it about our food we eat today.

The committee must say NO.

Or say YES and stand or fall by their forcing of FRANKEN food on a population that can exist without it.

6. Labelling proposal

GMO Bt maize must be labelled even if fed to animals. Tracing is essential as this Bt GMO food is known to be harmful and the more work done the more we know of its harm.

Organisation: Private Researcher

Country: France

Type: Individual

a. Assessment:

Molecular characterisation

no comment

Comparative analysis (for compositional analysis and agronomic traits and GM phenotype)

no comment

b. Food Safety Assessment:

Toxicology

The use of three different bacteria or parts are disturbing for our health. One is known for its

ability to induce tumours. One once harmless has new genetic forms lethal from the smallest exposure. One is used to kill every target organism while not affecting any good pest or any mammal. Clearly something based on wish more than science. This pathogen works by destroying the gut and this is the same cause for the near extinction of the domestic bee. Compare this to our failed efforts to eliminate the mosquito and it is evident that such annihilation only comes from vast areas of culture that is toxic to the bee and GMO planting fits this exactly.

Allergenicity

Allergenicity is something now found in most GMO plants that was not found before.

My research now show me that we most certainly did GMO alter the peanut and therefore this allergy which post dates GMO introduction is now widespread and lethal to those it sensitises.

Again the necessary need for most GMO plants to kill the pests but affect nothing else is not a science based fact.

Nutritional assessment

Have seen no industry based nutrition assessments.

Industry seems helbent on ownership without liability.

Industry seems to treat the world as something to be destroyed either directly or indirectly following the extinction of pure water courses and pure air. Pure food is rapidly becoming hard to find and expensive.

Government checks on nutrition show that in the effort to achieve the above, that nutrition value is lost.

Others

Syngenta Maize MIR604xGA21

This is a maize product which has been GMO'd by two different methods and crossed by traditional methods to yield a GMO product which can now be used in countries as a nonGMO product.

The future of GMO products may use this device to enable their GMO plants to get onto the market as being non GMO products.

This product MIR604xGA21 is a cross between a Monsanto GMO product and a Syngenta GMO product but the approvals where necessary which they are in Europe come not from either but from the UK government on behalf of not the two companies but Syngenta only.

All of these new GMO products may or may not be genuine attempts to introduce more nutritious, higher yielding products requiring less harmful pesticides which is or was the primary concerns of the two companies, Monsanto and Syngenta whose name and affiliations to other companies has changed many times in a few years. In any event while Europe is a world leader in many GMO technologies it has resisted wisely the mass plantings but concentrated upon techniques and the precautionary principle. Mass planting or the feeding of 300 million citizens with a product both toxic and lethal to organisms that eat it but not man is to follow the route used to excuse first heavy metal usage for farming, then organochlorine usage and finally organophosphate use. All of these at first proposed as harmful to insects but not man have ultimately proven toxic to all forms of life. GMO is already showing the same traits except in every case work is not published, work is denied and often the careers of those who report their science are destroyed often after long and tenacious campaigns often chasing them half way across the world to bring them to account for their science.

Approval for MIR604xGA21 has been granted for Japan and Korea and limited approval also for Mexico. These countries have seen new flu strains not previously seen and in one country the severity is such that it is invariably fatal to birds and causing even in France the total enclosure of previously free range bird populations. There is no proof that this GMO product of any GMO product has helped with the generation of new strains of pathogens but the rise in new pathogens generally matches the use of new and theoretically dangerous techniques of propagation. Organic forms of life whatever or wherever have the ability to expand to fill the vacuum where they did not exist before.

The first experiments on GMO were then in 1972 called hybridisation and a halt was called to the research for more than a year due to unforeseen health problems and a postulate that an AIDS like illness would result. Despite assurances in 1973 that such an illness did not exist and the harm thought possible by Professor Pollack was rather woolly by 1981 it was clear a new pathogen fatal to man was going to increase to pandemic levels and required much effort to contain its expansion.

Syngenta describe this MIR604xGA21 as having a « history of safe » use. This is rather reminiscent of their « safe use » of diazinon which in 2000 was halted for worldwide production on mutual grounds with USA regulators EPA and the chemical industry. This chemical arguably the most dangerous chemical made by man in terms of unsubstantiated deaths and illness to both man, animals and insects for which total destruction sometimes more than a year after spraying was both claimed and proven to be true. The first acceptances for MIR604xGA21 came in 2007, so rather than 40 years of safe use this product has at best 3 years of safe use. As Japan is itself wary of new technology and requires environmental and food safety assessments done it is difficult to imagine any safety of any time is claimable at present. The claims of the GMO industry must ALWAYS be challenged for authenticity and truth. Nothing can be accepted and often they themselves initiate the change themselves whether from pressure, oversight or ignorance of the new technology.

The product MIR604xGA21 uses three different pathogens to produce the product. First is agrobacterium tumefaciens known for its action of inducing tumours in the host organism; next comes E Coli once considered a harmless gut bacteria but which now since the use of it for GMO experiments now has many pathogenic strains some of which kill when as little as 10 enter the human body. Compare this to being able to drink a pound of the organism previously with no harm. Finally the bacillus thuringiensis which is used in many GMO products and has been implicated in bleeding disorders as well as inducing damage to the gut and liver of target and non target species.

In addition are the insertion of antibiotic markers causing known problems and in effect supplying the world with FORCED medications.

None of the application documents mentions the benefits to the consumer, to the farmer or for the improved safety of a plant that has been the principal diet of many nations in complete safety for more than a thousand years. Farmers accept new technology willingly but in most cases rapidly see the truth with respect to costs and often fall foul of industry that punishes those that seek to save seed to obtain financial advantage. In spite of this in the past five years some GMO products have gone up 5 fold while other food just 2 fold. Just 2 in contrast to 5 as salaries in this time will have risen less than ten times less.

Even in the applications of Syngenta for MIR604xGA21 the company mysteriously mention they have evidence of allergenicity from this partial product but give no further information other than they don't know the reason. Maize is regarded and has been totally safe previously

Environmental and food safety are both necessary and not asked for sought or wanted by the accepting panel of experts in Europe. This checking and more is essential for clarity, openness and honesty. The old practice of hounding out of office or restricting funds must be overcome by if you like rewards for saving our population from new harm. The UK BSE where GMO, chemicals and food all played their part the whistle blower guarantee was exposed as fraud when an eminent Professor from Leeds was summarily ejected from office for whistle blowing.

This MIR604xGA21 product and other GMO food and non food products are being introduced and accepted with undue haste to no one's benefit. They will not even benefit the company ultimately with Monsanto bankrupted or nearly so and rejuvenated into a new industry which now will accept no responsibility for past errors which in any event like the tobacco industry and oil industry will be forever denied.

Allergies to gluten are of recent origin and certainly post GMO technology. Maize contains gluten and while not the same as in wheat could induce allergy in wheat products. We are not certain of the cause for this allergy but it is serious to those involved. A friend who had this allergy and my age developed all manner of illnesses either directly or indirectly and died suddenly more than a decade ago. Allergies may not be fatal but can escalate to other problems. Gluten is regarded as SAFE for humans. GMO products are not regarded as SAFE to a very large number of people.

Every advantage claimed for GMO is propaganda or estimates later shown to be wrong. Practice shows that yields are down compared to non GMO with the potato application confirming this loss of yield. Financial advantages are for the non GMO producer often gaining several euros more per hectare of non GMO. Liability must fall on the shoulders of the companies that develop and use their scientists while in fact some countries blame the end user for any health effect on them. Some countries place the proper use and liability on the farmer. Everywhere blame shifting is happening but the industry insists there is no blame as the products are « safe ».

New illness mentioned with no origin of the source are getting longer:

AIDS no one wants to find the true origin or indeed the origin of this illness. GMO experiments in the area of the first outbreak just a very few years earlier, using monkey virus.

BSE blamed on food (but much food or treatment at the time would be GMO)

Morgellons using an old name for a new illness where fibres and not hair causes intense pain with evidence of a life form or near life form causing this that resists heat;

Bird flu A new strain with no proven origin but similar flu pathogens turning up in GMO companies vaccines.

Bleeding disorders: Appearing simultaneously around the world in many animals with reports that the new illness occurs in as little as 2 days after exposure to GMO products but not from non GMO products.

Wasting illness: Pigs in the UK experimentally fed on GMO products dying for no known reason in a new illness.

Obesity: Once almost unknown is now found in 44 per cent of USA citizens that are the world leaders in GMO as well as using old preGMO laws to force countries to reverse their decisions to accept GMO food or be bankrupted.

Unlabelled GMO: In many products in many countries GMO food is being introduced unknowing to a public that knows nothing about this product except that it is « safe » and many « unscientific » people are wanting to feed themselves and starve the rest of the world who will « benefit » from a new wonderful and equivalent food that allows no pesticide use and can be grown in any desert in the world without water. Amongst the lies that go as propaganda people are being experimented on and made ill without knowing the cause.

Europe has already accepted and approved GMO maize known to harm animals and humans and my own change of bowel habit once thought due to old age proves to get better by using non GMO products which in a Europe where labelling is required by law but gets only proven by expensive private testing many conditions thought to be due to old age are now normal thanks to a definite but very expensive non GMO diet. Meat has not yet been GMO'd but to increase the amount of meat and fish eaten while cutting maize products to zero is not going to help those who can't afford vegetables let alone prime steaks. My health problem is more and more being shown to be a function of food eaten and not pathogens making me ill.

The present situation of GMO acceptance needs revisiting with proof and more proof of an independent nature to show which of the known harmful GMO products accepted again show this harm.

We need a proper halt to GMO food for the masses in Europe. As a scientist working on such issues for 15 years I honestly believed the extent of GMO in Europe was close to zero. Below are some of the GMO products I have UNKNOWINGLY been exposed to of which several are DANGEROUS to EVERY human that eats them:

Cotton (MON1445) Cotton (MON15985) Cotton (MON15985 x MON1445) Cotton (MON531) Cotton (MON531 x MON1445) Cotton (LLCotton25) Maize (Bt11) Maize (DAS1507) Maize (GA21) Maize (MON810) Maize (MON863) Maize (MON863 x NK603) Maize (MON863 x MON810) Maize (NK603) Maize (NK603 x MON810) Maize (T25) Maize (DAS59122) Maize (DAS1507xNK603) Maize (MON89034) Maize (MON88017) Maize (59122xNK603) Maize (MIR604) Maize (MON863xMON810xNK603) Bacterial biomass Yeast biomass Oilseed rape (GT73) Swede-rape (MS8, RF3, MS8xRF3) Oilseed rape (T45) Starch potato (EH92-527-1) Soybean (MON40-3-2) Soybean (A2704-12) Soybean (MON89788) Sugar beet (H7-1)

3. Environmental risk assessment

The claim that escapes of the maize cannot exist does not square with my position next to a maize field where maize not only escapes but grows the next year before the field is planted. The winter this year was the coldest for decades.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

Halt the approvals and revisit those approved. Tell the public of the appearance in supermarkets of foods with more than 50 per cent unlabelled GMO and ask for help in affects particular on the gut and loss of normal bowel habits etc. Especially cases of uncontrolled bleeding.

6. Labelling proposal

Utilise the obligatory labelling require by law and test everyday products for contamination. Tell the public; Educate them on the SCIENCE rather than PROPAGANDA and LIES.
