Maize NK603 x MON810

Organisation: The European GMO-free Citizens (De Gentechvrije Burgers)
Country: The Netherlands
Type: Others...

a. Assessment:
b. Food Safety Assessment:
Toxicology

GLA and glyphosate. In 1987, the following article was published: Thomson, C. J. et al., 'Characterisation of the herbicide-resistance gene bar from S.hygroscopicus', EMBO Journal Vol. 6 No 9, pages 2519-23. It described how phosphinothricin-acetyltransferase also has glutamic acid as a substrate, by mixing the two substances and demonstrating the reaction product. Hoechst contested this in a report (93-01) by Dr Arno Schulz: 'L-phosphinothricin N acetyltransferase biochemical characterisation'. Glufosinate had been exposed, TOGETHER with a seriously excessive amount of glutamic acid (and other amino acids) to the effects of the acetyltransferase. Schulz had been unable to demonstrate ANY reaction product with glutamic acid and thus concluded that glutamic acid was not a substrate. THIS IS INCORRECT AND HIGHLY MISLEADING because • in situations in which the acetyltransferase (present in the modified plant) could have a toxic effect, as in our gastrointestinal tract, large quantities of glufosinate are not simultaneously present (see Thomson). Unbelievable! • it is only logical that, under Schulz's test conditions, the acetyltransferase would acetylate the glufosinate using not only the added acetyl source but also acetylated glutamine acid as an acetyl source (because the transferase has a higher affinity for glufosinate). In a MIXTURE a reaction product will be produced only with the substrate for which it has the highest affinity. A VERY MISLEADING REPORT. We object to the development of a GMO containing this gene product. 1. According to Hoechst, it is not teratogenic. E. Ebert et al.: 'Summary of safety evaluation toxicity studies of glufosinate ammonium', 1989/1990. Defects found in rabbit progeny were brushed under the carpet by Hoechst, which claimed that they were the result of 'maternal toxicity'!! The toxic effect on the mother was claimed to prevent her giving birth to healthy progeny. We believe they are playing fast and loose with the words they use. We would put forward instead the research data of Tomoko Fujii et al., from 1996: 'Alterations in the Response to Kainic Acid in Rats Exposed to Glufosinate Ammonium, a Herbicide, during Infantile Period', a study

sponsored by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture. 'Exposure to GLA, even in low doses (1 mg/kg) during Infantile Period in the rat, induces alterations in the kainic receptor in the brain'. T. Watanabe, 1996: 'Apoptose induced by GLA in the neuroepithelium of developing mouse embryos in culture'. Programmed cell death as a result of the secretion of substances which destroy the cell from within; this 'suicide' is regulated by a suicide gene which appears to be activated by GLA. T. Watanabe et al., 1997: 'Developmental and dysmorphogenic effects of GLA in mouse embryos in culture'. Deformities. 2. It is not considered to be sensitising. Ms L. Eijsten discovered for herself the exact opposite of GLA's 'non-sensitising properties', something she has reported previously. In 1992, she - and her dog - became sensitised: a parks department employee carried on spraying the edges of the grass in a park, where she was sitting reading on a bench, with Finale SL 14. Nothing apparently amiss. However, a year later she was walking her dog by grass which had shortly before been sprayed with the same herbicide and promptly, seven hours later, her legs were covered in eczema. She walked the same route the next day, this time in a sleeveless blouse, and within no time her arms and face were also covered in eczema (the dog too had red patches on its stomach). She has reported on this many times already. The serious thing is, however, that every attempt is made to brush these facts under the carpet, arguing that her symptoms were caused by a food allergy (letter of 10 June 1996 from Mr Top / Ms Terpstra at the Netherlands Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport (VWS); a very scientific communication. The photograph sent showed clearly that the eczema was on unprotected parts of Ms Eijsten's body. And there was no eczema on the back of her hands - logically, because she had washed her hands after the contact. A dermatologist carried out tests involving patches with Vaseline to which the herbicide had been added. This meant that a hydrophilic substances was being tested using a hydrophobic substance. It was logical that no effect should be visible after the test. The dermatologist carried out tests in the same way three times, despite Ms Eijsten's request that a hydrophilic substances, such as lanolin, be used, or that the herbicide be tested on her skin by itself. His argument was that he always worked that way, thus making his incompetence clear. He had previously told her that he did not know the herbicide in question and had asked her to bring some with her. That was strange, because Finale had already been in use for some 20 years. This was also why she collected various articles about Finale and showed the dermatologist an American book describing methods for demonstrating sensitisation. EU LEGISLATION prescribes many methods for demonstrating sensitisation. Ms Eijsten constantly wondered why the dermatologist did not want to carry out any different tests. She found this all very improper. If all dermatologists in the Netherlands took the same approach as 'her dermatologist', no cases of eczema resulting from GLA would ever be found! Why should the correct tests not be done? We believe that everything possible is being done to cover up the harmful effects of GLA. The annual report of the organisation

Consument en Biotechnologie for 1996/1997 reported that Fujii's 1996 report stated that high doses had been found to cause brain damage. And it should be noted that it was Ms Eijsten who sent the report in question to Consument en Biotechnologie, at their request. The report concerned precisely the fact that the work had been done using very small doses (1 mg/kg). When she complained, they promised to correct the errors. Recently she was informed that no correction is to be made. No reason was given. This twisting of the truth is an example of false lobbying. We believe that the above information on sensitisation has to be communicated once again, against the background of the dangers which arise when herbicides are sprayed and as a result of drift when herbicideresistant crops are cultivated, be it on a large or a small scale. Murphy's law. http://www.gentechvrij.nl/rvs9907.html, extract from: Objection to a draft decision on herbicide resistance by J. van der Meulen, L. Eijsten (ISIS). ISIS Announcement 20/08/15 Announcing ISIS Special Report Banishing Glyphosate Glyphosate/Roundup, falsely claimed by Monsanto to be safe and harmless, has become the world's most widely and pervasively used herbicide, especially with glyphosate tolerant GM crops; it has brought rising tides of birth defects, cancers, fatal kidney disease, sterility, and dozens of other illnesses. Read the devastating evidence & ban glyphosate herbicides from you home and local community Dr Eva Sirinathsinghji & Dr Mae-Wan Ho with Dr Medardo Ávila-Vázquez, Dr Don M. Huber, Dr Rosemary Mason, Ib Borup Pederson, Prof Peter Saunders, & Dr Nancy Swanson Sign the Independent Scientists Manifesto on Glyphosate here: http://www.isis.org.uk/Independent_Scientists_Manifesto_on_Glyphosate.php Download the report here (11mb) http://www.i-sis.org.uk/Banishing_Glyphosate.pdf Glyphosate was released as an herbicide in 1974, and rapidly became the world's most popular herbicide especially since the introduction of genetically modified (GM) glyphosate-tolerant crops in the 1990s. Currently, 85 % of GM crops are herbicide-tolerant, with glyphosate-tolerant crops making up the vast majority of those planted. In the US for example which is the largest producer of GM crops, 93 % of soybean and 85 % of maize crops are glyphosate-tolerant. A total of 137 glyphosatetolerant varieties have been approved by May 2015 (see Supplement Table 1 Approved glyphosate tolerant crops). There are 19 varieties of cotton, 115 of soybean and 81 of maize; and in addition, 1 wheat, 2 sugar beet, 4 potato, 3 Polish canola, 8 Argentine canola, 1 creeping bentgrass and 3 alfalfa. 80 % of these crops are stacked, containing additional traits such as tolerance to glufosinate and 2,4-D herbicides and/or pesticidal properties. Of the glyphosate-tolerant crops generated, over 99 % of those grown belong to only four species - soybean, maize, cotton and canola. According to the new yearly report from industry funded International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-Biotech Applications (ISAAA) [1], "18 million farmers in 28 countries planted more than 181 million hectares [of GM crops] in 2014, up from 175 million in 27 countries in 2013." This has spurred huge sales of glyphosate, giving it a market value of US$5.4 billion in 2012 with a total demand of 718 ooo tonnes [2]. Globally it is a key

ingredient in more than 700 products [3] and is also used to control weed in gardens, along roadsides in commercial and residential areas, and on millions of hectares of farmland. Its presence is pervasive, in the air, in the soil, in our food and drinking water (see Chapter 1). Underlying its success has been the repeated claim that the chemical is benign for human health, that its killing mechanism for plants works via an enzyme that does not exist in animals and is therefore safe for both human and animals. This claim goes counter to evidence that existed right from the start. Studies revealed both carcinogenicity and teratogenicity as far back as the 1980s, but were buried by industry with the support of regulatory bodies such as the US Environmental Protection Agency and the European Food Safety Authority (see Chapter 5 and [4] EU Regulators and Monsanto Exposed for Hiding Glyphosate Toxicity, SiS 51). Meanwhile, overwhelming evidence of glyphosate toxicity across the globe has come to light. Everywhere, people are seeing steep rises in cancers, birth defects and other serious illnesses as glyphosate use increases. The World Health Organisation's recent re-assessment of glyphosate as a 'probable carcinogen' vindicates the evidence witnessed by communities, researchers, doctors and campaigners for many years. Despite rising glyphosate use and GM crop cultivation, recent data show that global GM crop adoption rates are falling, covering only 3.5 % of arable land. The markets of high-adoption rate countries are becoming saturated, while few additional countries have been cultivating GM crops, indicating that nations and farmers are turning their backs on a failing technology [5]. With the rise of weeds evolving resistance to glyphosate, US Farmers reported a decline in the effectiveness of glyphosate on almost 44 % of acres planted with soybeans in 2012. More than 47 % of those acres are in the Corn Belt, which contains the majority of soybean acreage in the United States, followed by the Northern Plains (23 %), Delta (11 %), Lake States (10 %), and Appalachia (9 %).The failure of GM crops could also have a major impact on the future of glyphosate use [6]. With its increasing lack of efficacy on top of the rising awareness of its toxicity, people across the globe are taking action to rid glyphosate from their farms, their food and their land, air, and water. Lawsuits are being filed against Monsanto both in the US for false claims of safety, and in China for hiding the toxicology documents used for registering the chemical in the country. China is the world's largest producer of glyphosate and the largest importer of GM soybeans [7] (How Grain SelfSufficiency, Massive Soybean Imports & Glyphosate Exports Led China to Devastate People & Planet, SiS 67); and feelings are running high against both. A recent petition has even gone so far as to call for the complete overhaul of the Ministry of Agriculture, whose Agricultural GMO Safety Evaluation is deemed inadequate for ensuring that "GMOs developed abroad or within China are safe". It goes on to claim that there has been collusion between them and Monsanto, resulting in the submission of "fake samples", the carrying out of "false tests" as well as the falsification of "safety conclusions" (see [8] China's Ministry of Agriculture Accused of Colluding with Monsanto, SiS 67). The ultimate rejection of glyphosate

and GM crops by the Chinese people could be a turning point not just for China but the world. Meanwhile in Argentina, a federal judge has accepted an unprecedented class action lawsuit demanding a ban on GM foods and their associated pesticides [9]. Defendants of this case include not only all the major GM crop and chemical corporations, but the Argentine national government and the Federal Council for the environment. Claiming that GMOs contribute to the trend towards monoculture, direct seeding with consequent reduction of rural labour, concentration of profit in few producers and impacts of health of rural populations and environment, the lawsuit demands the passing of a biosafety law, labelling of GM crops, and the remediation of environmental damage such as the soil in addition to the bans. The WHO declaration may well be the final nail in the coffin for Monsanto's flagship product, as it has intensified campaigns to ban the chemical. Several countries are already implementing bans of the chemical just 2 months after their assessment was published [10] (Fallout from WHO Classification of Glyphosate as Probable Carcinogen, SiS 67). Sri Lanka, suffering from an epidemic of fatal kidney disease, is the first to declare a complete and immediate ban. Earlier, Bermuda has banned glyphosate imports with immediate effect. And Colombia will no longer use it for its large aerial campaigns to destroy illegal coca plantations, a US-led war on drugs that is displacing Colombian citizens and compromising their land and water supplies. The Ecology Minister of France has ordered garden centres to stop selling it [11] and even private companies are taking the chemical off their shelves [12, 13, 14]. At a scientific UK parliament briefing on the 15 July, the Soil Association called for a ban of wheat pre-season spraying destined for bread after tests conclude that UK glyphosate use has risen by 400 % in the last 20 years [15]. Also attending was a member of the glyphosate researcher from WHO's IARC who reiterated the findings stating that glyphosate is "definitely genotoxic". Healthcare workers and campaigners are demanding action from governments that have so far supported the use of glyphosate, with Argentina seeing a recent statement backed by 30 000 healthcare professionals to ban its use completely, in line with the WHO assessment that vindicates all their work documenting rising rates of cancers and other illnesses linked to widespread GM soy cultivation. Their message seems to be getting through, with the Argentinian town of Lago Puelo now taking action to ban the marketing and use of glyphosate [16]. The EU is yet to make the final decision, expected later this year, on whether it will re-approve glyphosate. The approval process by the EU commission thus far relying on a summary of data provided by a consortium of chemical companies including Monsanto that form the Glyphosate Task Force, it is time that we make sure that the EU does not continue to corrupt the approval process and instead take into account the WHO assessment as well as the many other independent studies that were omitted from the assessment by the task force (see Chapter 11). This report summarises the converging pattern of glyphosate toxicities from farm to clinic to the laboratory that leaves us in no doubt glyphosate must be banished (a combination of ban and vanish)

from our homes, our cities and fields as a matter of urgency. A global ban is in order; the momentum to do so is already gathering pace. But we must start as individuals, in our family and home, our local communities. Above all, we must take this opportunity to stop poisoning people and planet with agrochemicals and shift comprehensively to sustainable, organic, non-GM agriculture that can truly guarantee food security under climate change (see [17] Food Futures Now *Organic *Sustainable *Fossil Fuel Free, ISIS Special Report) . All chapters in this report (except Chapter 9 by Professor Emeritus of plant pathology Dr Don Huber) are selected from articles published by ISIS online and in print between 2013 and 2015. Chapter 1 is updated and substantially enlarged from [18] A Roundup of Roundup Reveals Converging Pattern of Toxicity from Farm to Clinic (SiS 65) incorporating Chapter 1 of [19] Ban GMOS Now (ISIS special report). Chapter 2 is from [20] Marked Deterioration of Public Health Parallels Increase in GM Crops and Glyphosate Use, US Government Data Show (SiS 65). Chapter 3 is updated from [21] Devastating Impacts of Glyphosate Use with GMO Seeds in Argentina (SiS 66). Chapters 4 and 5 are from [22, 23] Glyphosate/Roundup& Human Male Infertility, Glyphosate & Cancer (SiS 62). Chapter 6 is updated from [24] Sri Lanka Partially Bans Glyphosate for Deadly Kidney Disease Epidemic (SiS 62). Chapter 7 is from [25] Changing from GMO to Non-GMO Natural Soy, Experiences from Denmark (SiS 64). Chapter 8 is updated from [26] USDA scientist reveals All (SiS53). Chapter 10 is from [27] How Roundup Poisoned my Nature Reserve (SiS 64). Chapter 11 is from [28] Scandal of Glyphosate Re-assessment in Europe(SiS 63). Chapter 12 is from [29] Glyphosate 'Probably Carcinogenic to Humans' Latest WHO Assessment (SiS 66). We thank all our co-authors who have contributed to separate chapters of this report, adding invaluable personal perspectives and especially first hand personal experiences of glyphosate toxicities. Contents Preface 1. Converging Pattern of Toxicity from Farm to Clinic to Laboratory Studies Dr Eva Sirinathsinghji 2. Marked Deterioration of Public Health Parallels Increase in GM Crops & Glyphosate Use, US Government Data Show Prof Peter Saunders 3. Devastating Impacts of Glyphosate and GMOs in Argentina Dr Medardo Ávila-Vázquez 4. Glyphosate/Roundup & Human Male Infertility Dr Mae-Wan Ho 5. Gyphosate & Cancer Dr Mae Wan Ho 6. Sri Lanka Bans Glyphosate for Deadly Kidney Disease Epidemic Dr Eva Sirinathsinghji 7. Changing from GMO to Non-GMO Natural Soy, Farming Experiences from Denmark Ib Borup Pederson 8. Glyphosate and Metal Chelation – A Mechanism of Toxicity Dr Eva Sirinathsinghji 9. Glyphosate & Crops Diseases Old and New Dr Don Huber 10. How Roundup® Poisoned my Nature Reserve Rosemary Mason MB ChB FRCA 11. Scandal of Glyphosate Re-assessment in Europe Dr Nancy Swanson and Dr Mae Wan Ho 12. Glyphosate 'Probably Carcinogenic to Humans' Latest WHO Assessment Dr Mae-Wan Ho and Dr Nancy Swanson Download the report here (11mb) http://www.isis.org.uk/Banishing_Glyphosate.pdf http://www.i-sis.org.uk/Banishing_Glyphosate.php

Others

16 October 2012 (source: *Werkgroep Burgers voor gentechvrijvoedsel* [Citizens' Working Group for GM-Free Food]) For the first time ever, a food study has been reported on in which 200 rats were fed with Monsanto's genetically modified maize variety NK603 for longer than the 90-day period recommended* by the EFSA for the EU. This variety, which was approved in the EU a number of years ago, is mainly used as cattle feed. The study was conducted by Professor Seralini and his staff at the CRIIGEN Institute at the University of Caen, France. Given the exceptionally rapid response to the publication of the study on the part of pro-GM scientists and public bodies such as the EFSA, we can reasonably assume that those championing genetic engineering regarded the study as very unwelcome and ominous. The study demonstrated the development of cancerous tumours and premature death in the test animals over a period of 2 years. A distinction was made between the following diets: NK603 (GMO), NK603 + the herbicide Roundup (GMO+R), and Roundup on its own (R). There were 20 groups in all, including the controls, each consisting of 10 rats. The male and female animals showed different reactions. For a short film showing the results of the Seralini study, click on: https://vimeo.com/49794058

* and then only if a 'lack' of 'substantial equivalence' with the isogenic version of the crop warrants this … how's that for a scientific approach? Who determines what is 'substantially equivalent'? When is 'substantial equivalence' deemed to be lacking? And just how isogenic *is* isogenic?

3. Environmental risk assessment

MON810 Genome Rearranged Again Stability of All Transgenic Lines in Doubt Dr. Mae-Wan Ho This report has been submitted to the EFSA on behalf of I-SIS

The instability of transgenic lines is not exactly news, but something too seldom reported, being The Best Kept Secret of GM Crops [1], and even we in I-SIS have missed this item hidden in the final paragraphs of a technical paper published in 2003, which found new signs of instability in a transgenic maize that has been grown commercially since 1995. Researchers from the Institute of Molecular Biology in Barcelona, Spain, analysed MON810 maize Certified Reference Material (CRM) obtained from the European Commission’s Institute for Reference Materials and

Measurements (IRMM) and commercialised by Fluka (Buchs, Switzerland); using the most sophisticated and sensitive polymerase chain reaction (PCR) methods available [2]. They found that the transgene insert had rearranged and probably moved, yet again, from its whereabouts reported a year ago, when MON810 maize, along with at least 5 other lines were found to have rearranged, and no longer matched the genetic maps provided by the companies [3-5] (Transgenic Lines Proven Unstable, SiS 20; Unstable Transgenic Lines Illegal, SiS 21). These initial discoveries [3-5] were so serious that on 28 November 2003, I wrote to Dr. William Moens, Head of the Service of Biosafety and Biotechnology (SBB), Scientific Institute of Public Health (IPH), which had reported one of the two different sets of data on transgenic inserts, and I raised two important issues [6]: "First, there appears to be both major and minor inconsistencies between the results reported by your Institute and those reported by the French laboratories. Could that be due to methodological problems or to different samples of the same transgenic line being analysed? If the latter is the case, it would suggest that the transgenic lines are not only unstable (see below) but also non-uniform. In other words, they do not pass the DUS [Distinct, Uniform and Stable] test, which I understand, is required by European law [for a commercial variety]. "Second, the new EU Directive 2001/18/EC specifically requires event-specific molecular data documenting genetic stability (Annex IIIB) as a condition for market approval. In view of the finding that practically every transgenic insert has rearranged from that reported in the company's dossier, it would indicate that the transgenic lines have failed the test of genetic stability, and are no longer the same lines that were risk assessed, and in some cases, placed on the market. "For either or both those reasons, it would seem illegal, under European law, to grant those transgenic lines commercial approval; and the lines that have been approved should surely now be withdrawn." The reply from Dr. Moens came two days later. It stated [7]: "I thank you very much for your email and related data. The experts of the Belgian Biosafety Council are just busy to evaluate in a hurry all these elements. Your email and data have been transmitted for further review. "No doubt that the outcome of such analysis will be handled on a transparent way within delays that are not yet defined. (sic) I can guarantee you that I'll make you aware about our conclusions when legally possible." I never heard from Moens or anyone else from SBB again. In December 2007, I resent my message and Moens' reply to him, to remind him that I was still awaiting his answer, but received nothing so far. The reason seems to be that our regulators have allowed the companies to submit new data, and probably even new certified reference materials, in order to justify continued market approval, which is still illegal . The Spanish finding highlights how unstable a transgenic line could be. Specifically, the Spanish team characterized the 3' region (tail end) of the transgenic insert, and found it was no longer in the long terminal repeat (LTR) of the alpha Zein gene cluster of the maize genome, as reported a year ago [3-5]. Furthermore, they failed to get any PCR product from the wild type maize genome that corresponds to the site at which

the transgenic insert had landed. That is indicative of substantial genome scrambling at the MON810 transgenic insertion site; and there are other signs that further sequences have been deleted from the original insert. Recently, researchers in the Industrial Toxicology Research Centre in Marg Lucknow, India, have also analysed the MON810 insert using multiple PCR primers, and came to the same conclusion [8]: their finding "confirms the structural instability of MON810 transgene cassettes." Contrary to Monsanto's claim that nptII is absent in MON810, they consistently found the presence of nptII as well as Tnos in their sample. This inconsistency has been noted previously [5]. Another research team at the University of Florence, Italy, has just published their characterization of the 3' insertion site of MON810 [9] and identified scrambled sequences belonging to the maize HECT E3 ubiquitin ligase. They found several new mRNAs that are fusion proteins of the truncated Cry1Ab and the uibiquitin ligase sequences, the safety implications of which are totally unknown. For at least the past ten years, I have been looking for credible evidence that transgenic line is stable and found none. That remains true to-date. The transgenic insert is not the same as a natural piece of DNA. Transgenic DNA has features that make it behave somewhat like a loose cannon even after it has inserted into a genome, it can jump elsewhere in the same genome, scrambling the genome on the way, or it can insert into the genome of another cell [10] (Horizontal Gene Transfer from GMOs Does Happen, SiS 38) to wreak the same unpredictable havoc, and worse, to activate cancer genes with its revved up promoter that makes the transgene over-express out of control. Article first published 11/03/08

References Ho MW. The best kept secret of GM crops. Witness statement in ACRE Open Hearing on the criticisms of T25 GM maize risk assessment, February 2002, http://www.i-sis.org.uk/secretGMcrops.php Hernández M, Pla M, Esteve T, Prat S Puigdomènech P and Ferrando A. A specific real-time quantitative PCR detection system for event MON810 in maize YieldGard based on the 3'-transgene integration sequence. Transgenic Research 2003, 170-89. Collonier C, Berthier G, Boyer F, Duplan M-N, Fernandez S, Kebdani N, Kobilinsky A, Romanuk M, Bertheau Y. Characterization of commercial GMO inserts: a source of useful material to study genome fluidity. Poster presented at ICPMB: International Congress for Plant Molecular Biology (n°VII), Barcelona, 23-28th June 2003. Poster courtesy of Pr. Gilles-Eric Seralini, Président du Conseil Scientifique du CRII-GEN, www.criigen.org Ho MW. Transgenic lines proven unstable. Science in Society 20, 35, 2003. Ho MW. Unstable transgenic lines illegal. Science in Society 21, 23, 2003. Ho MW. E-mail message to Dr. William Moens, Service of Biosafety and Biotechnology (SBB), Scientific Institute of Public Health (IPH), 28 November 2003. Moens W. Reply to Ho MW. 30 November 2003. Singh CK, Ojka A, Kamle S and Kachru DN. Assessment of cry1Ab transgene cassette in commercial Bt corn MON810: gene, event, construct & GMO specific concurrent characterization. Nature Protocols 2007,

DOI: 10.1038/nprot.2007.440,
http://www.natureprotocols.com/2007/10/23/assessment_of_cry1ab_transgene.php
Rosati A, Bogani P, Santarlasci A and Buiatti M. Characterisation of 4' transgene insertion site and derived mRNAs in MON810 YieldGard maize. Plant Mol Biol DOI 10.1007/s11103-008-9315-7 Ho MW and Cummins J. Horizontal gene transfer really happens. Science in Society 38 (to appear). All from http://www.i-sis.org.uk/MON810GenomeRearranged.php

---

4. Conclusions and recommendations

The GMO-free Citizens do not want to eat this. It is not healthy we want to eat organic. The prove that it is poisonous is proven by Prof. Séralini.

Organisation: The European GMO-free Citizens (De Gentechvrije Burgers)
Country: The Netherlands
Type: Others...

---

a. Assessment:
Others

Addition: General Court of the European Union strengthens the precautionary principle

Legal revision of risks of genetically engineered soybeans is admissible in court Wednesday, 14 March 2018 The General Court of the European Union today confirmed the right of civil society organisations to submit legal cases concerning the health risks of genetically engineered plants. The case was prompted by market authorisation being issued for the import of genetically engineered soybeans produced by US companies Monsanto and DuPont/ Pioneer which, according to analysis undertaken by Testbiotech and other experts, have not been adequately investigated for health risks. The EU Commission wanted to prevent Testbiotech from initiating a legal revision of a decision allowing the import of these genetically engineered

soybeans. In response, Testbiotech filed a precedent case at the General Court of the European Union to gain access to justice (T-33/16). The Court today confirmed the rights of Testbiotech. https://www.testbiotech.org/en/node/2169

Organisation: individual
Country: Germany
Type: Others...

---

a. Assessment:
Molecular characterisation

People do not want to eat GMO. If you ask them whether they would like to eat normal food or GMO modified food the majoritiy of the people says: I do not want GMO. Please let tpresident and management and their families of the aplying firm eat thier GMO modified stuff for hundred years (more generations), than we test these people and if no concern, than OK you can do business with GMO food.

Anyway, let make a clean label, please let the labelling clear, that yonsumer can make real choice!

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

People do not want to eat GMO. If you ask them whether they would like to eat normal food or GMO modified food the majoritiy of the people says: I do not want GMO. Please let tpresident and management and their families of the aplying firm eat thier GMO modified stuff for hundred years (more generations), than we test these people and if no concern, than OK you can do business with GMO food.

Anyway, let make a clean label, please let the labelling clear, that yonsumer can make real choice!

b. Food Safety Assessment:
Toxicology

People do not want to eat GMO. If you ask them whether they would like to eat normal food or GMO modified food the majoritiy of the people says: I do not want GMO. Please let tpresident and management and their families of the aplying firm eat thier GMO modified stuff for hundred years (more generations), than we test these people and if no concern, than OK you can do business with GMO food.

Anyway, let make a clean label, please let the labelling clear, that yonsumer can make real choice!

Allergenicity

People do not want to eat GMO. If you ask them whether they would like to eat normal food or GMO modified food the majoritiy of the people says: I do not want GMO. Please let tpresident and management and their families of the aplying firm eat thier GMO modified stuff for hundred years (more generations), than we test these people and if no concern, than OK you can do business with GMO food.

Anyway, let make a clean label, please let the labelling clear, that yonsumer can make real choice!

Nutritional assessment

People do not want to eat GMO. If you ask them whether they would like to eat normal food or GMO modified food the majoritiy of the people says: I do not want GMO. Please let tpresident and management and their families of the aplying firm eat thier GMO modified stuff for hundred years (more generations), than we test these people and if no concern, than OK you can do business with GMO food.

Anyway, let make a clean label, please let the labelling clear, that yonsumer can make real choice!

Others

People do not want to eat GMO. If you ask them whether they would like to eat normal food or GMO modified food the majoritiy of the people says: I do not want GMO. Please let tpresident and management and their families of the aplying firm eat thier GMO modified stuff for hundred years (more generations), than we test these people and if no concern, than OK you can do business with GMO food.

Anyway, let make a clean label, please let the labelling clear, that yonsumer can make real choice!

3. Environmental risk assessment

People do not want to eat GMO. If you ask them whether they would like to eat normal food or GMO modified food the majoritiy of the people says: I do not want GMO. Please let tpresident and management and their families of the aplying firm eat thier GMO modified stuff for hundred years (more generations), than we test these people and if no concern, than OK you can do business with GMO food.

Anyway, let make a clean label, please let the labelling clear, that yonsumer can make real choice!

4. Conclusions and recommendations

People do not want to eat GMO. If you ask them whether they would like to eat normal food or GMO modified food the majoritiy of the people says: I do not want GMO. Please let tpresident and management and their families of the aplying firm eat thier GMO modified stuff for hundred years (more generations), than we test these people and if no concern, than OK you can do business with GMO food.

Anyway, let make a clean label, please let the labelling clear, that yonsumer can make real choice!

5. Others

People do not want to eat GMO. If you ask them whether they would like to eat normal food or GMO modified food the majoritiy of the people says: I do not want GMO. Please let tpresident and management and their families of the aplying firm eat thier GMO modified stuff for hundred years (more generations), than we test these people and if no concern, than OK you can do business with GMO food.

Anyway, let make a clean label, please let the labelling clear, that yonsumer can make real choice!

---

6. Labelling proposal

People do not want to eat GMO. If you ask them whether they would like to eat normal food or GMO modified food the majoritiy of the people says: I do not want GMO. Please let tpresident and management and their families of the aplying firm eat thier GMO modified stuff for hundred years (more generations), than we test these people and if no concern, than OK you can do business with GMO food.

Anyway, let make a clean label, please let the labelling clear, that yonsumer can make real choice!
