

Report from the Skill-share on Genetic Engineering

held in Csilleberc, Budapest, Hungary

1-3 May 1998

Prepared by Iza Kruszewska, UNED UK and ANPED

GE or not GE

Charity Know How Reference No.: 1808

The skill-share was made possible by the generous funding provided by the UK's Charity Know How Fund with additional financial support from ANPED, The Northern Alliance for Sustainability. ANPED receives funding from the EU's DGXI and the Dutch Environment Ministry, VROM.



The Northern Alliance for Sustainability

ANPED is a network of NGOs based in the northern hemisphere. It strives to change unsustainable consumption and production patterns with an emphasis on the North. ANPED's role is to build sustainable societies by empowering grassroots organisations through sharing knowledge and skills, common campaigns, publications, and participation in and lobbying at international governmental conferences. ANPED networks groups working on Local Agenda 21, Corporate Accountability, Clean Production and Genetic Engineering.

ANPED is a democratic network of NGOs and voluntary organisations. Membership is open to any such organisation sharing our aims.



UNED-UK

The United Nations Environment and Development- UK Committee

UNED-UK is a forum for anyone involved in the process of sustainable development. The organisation was set up in the wake of the Earth Summit, in 1992, to facilitate the involvement of different sectors in the implementation of Agenda 21. UNED facilitates round-tables, bringing together government, NGOs, academics, women's and youth groups, trade unions, local government and private enterprise, to discuss and provide input into the Commission on Sustainable Development and other UN activities. UNED also works to inform the public and empower grassroots organisations to participate in UN international processes.

All information in this report may be used freely, with mention of source. Please send a copy of the publication to the ANPED International Secretariat.

This report is available from the ANPED secretariat. Single copies for non-members of the ANPED and the UNED network will cost Nfl. 10,-. Members and partners of both organisations, as well as participants of this skill-share may receive a copy for free. Please send in your order to ANPED, International Secretariat, P.O. Box 12111, 3501 AC Utrecht, The Netherlands.

For further questions about this programme, you can call ANPED at +31-30-2310300; fax +31-30-2340878; e-mail: anped@anped.org. You can also visit our web-site www.anped.org

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. BACKGROUND AND AGENDA	1
DAY 1	2
Opening	2
3.2 Introductions of Participants	2
3.3 What prompted participants to become interested in GE	2
3.4 Expectations from the Skill-share	2
3.5 The Advantages of GE - Fact or Fiction?	2
3.6 What are the Dangers of GE Food and Agriculture?	3
3.7 What is happening in CEE and NIS?	4
3.7.1 Hungary - Veronika Mora, ETK	4
First Step - Building an NGO Alliance	4
Second Step - Raising Public Awareness	5
Third Step - Legislation on Genetic Engineering in Hungary	5
GE Food Labelling in Hungary	6
3.7.2 Poland - Margaret Jermak (Green Federation), Iza Kruszewska	6
First Step - Building an Alliance	6
Second Step - Public Outreach	6
GE as a Right to Know Campaign	6
Third Step - Targeting Transnational Corporations	7
Fourth Step - Legislation	7
3.7.3 Georgia - Maka Jorjadze, ELKANA	7
DAY 2	8
4 Genetic Engineering Examined	8
4.1 GE Food - GE Soybeans, Maize and Now Rape	8
4.2 Patenting of Life - The EU Patenting Directive	9
4.3 Regulatory Regimes for GE	10
4.4 Using Regional and International Fora to Highlight GE	10
4.4.1 Environment for Europe (EfE)	10
4.4.2 Commission on Sustainable Development, 7 th Session	11
4.4.3 WHO Conference on Health and Environment	11
4.5 Positive Stories - Successful Strategies and Actions	11
4.6 Action Planning	12
DAY 3	14
5.1 Getting your Message Across	14

5.2 Networking - Matching Resources and Needs	14
5.3 Evaluation	14
5.4 Outcomes of the Skill-share	14
5.5 Press Conference	14
SKILL-SHARE FOLLOW-UP	15
ANNEX 1: PROVISIONAL SKILLSHARE AGENDA	16
ANNEX 2 : LIST OF PARTICIPANTS TO GENETIC ENGINEERING TRAINING AND SKILLSHARE	19

1. Introduction

The skill-share was organised by ANPED, based in Utrecht, The Netherlands, UNED UK in London and ETK, in Budapest. It brought together 27 NGO activists and scientists from 13 countries in Western and Central-Eastern Europe and NIS (Newly Independent States) for an intensive 3 day training and skillsharing on genetic engineering, its applications and associated threats, as well as strategies to influence decision-makers. The objective was to strengthen existing GE campaigns in the region and to generate momentum for new campaigns on this issue in countries where there are none.

The skill-share facilitators used the 'transformational approach' to bridge some of the power-learning blocks inherent in such a diverse group of participants. The skill-share was designed to minimise the various polarities within the group, including west-east, male-female, age, experience of campaigning on genetic engineering and language problems. Presentations were short and kept to a minimum with most of the work done interactively in smaller work groups.

2. Background and Agenda

The widening gap between public awareness with respect to genetically engineered (GE) food and the patenting of life, between Western and Eastern Europe is a cause of grave concern.

With respect to GE food, the countries of CEE and NIS are faced with two threats: first, imports of GE crops from the US, and second, their own domestic genetic experiments. Both are taking place with no legal controls, no procedures for public consultation or participation in decision-making, and no requirements for labelling of foods already containing GE ingredients.

Without more public awareness and pressure on governments, producers and retailers to act, countries in CEE and NIS could become the targets for GE foods, which are unwanted or even banned in EU member states, such as Austria.

Although NGO campaigns in Poland and Hungary are alerting the public to GE food and promoting the organic alternative, very little is happening elsewhere in the region. During the workshop on health and environment in Bled, NGOs from CEE and NIS expressed their ignorance of genetic engineering and hence their reluctance to work on it, given its complex and multi-dimensional nature. Genetic engineering takes in bio-safety, human health, medical, environmental, ethical and consumer issues, to name but a few.

The skill-share programme is attached as Annex 1.

3. Day 1

3.1 Opening

Iza Kruszewska welcomed the participants and described the participatory nature of a skill-share. Its objective is to start more co-operation between east and west on genetic engineering (GE), by providing an opportunity for information sharing and networking.

There is also the potential of developing joint projects; for example, in tracking and exposing the double standards of Western-based transnational corporations in the east. Most transnationals that are selling GE crops and food products in the east are from the West, e.g. producers, like Monsanto (US), Novartis (Switzerland) and AgrEvo (Germany) and retailers, like Billa and Julius Meindl. Some are undertaking activities that would be either illegal or extremely controversial in Western Europe, by exploiting the public ignorance, the absence of legislation and the political instability in parts of the region.

To alert the participants to the urgency of the threat, Iza gave the example of the US maize gluten-feed, containing genetically engineered maize strains, which was imported from the US to Switzerland, via Rotterdam in February 1998. Since this strain of GE maize has not been approved for use in the EU or in Switzerland, the Swiss authorities sent the shipment back to Rotterdam. They are now looking for a country in CEE to dump this illegal animal feed.

3.2 Introductions of Participants

Working in pairs, participants were asked to interview each other and then present their partners to the rest of the group. A List of Participants is attached as Annex 2. The interview was to find out about each other and answer the following two questions:

1. What prompted you to become interested in genetic engineering/What prompted you to come to the skill-share?
2. What are your expectations of the skill-share?

3.3 What prompted participants to become interested in GE?

Ethical issues around mankind 'playing God' and the inherent dangers of genetic engineering are the concerns that drew most people to this issue. For those participants campaigning for organic agriculture, the concerns were related more to intensive agriculture, human health and the new threats posed by GE food - which they believe is just unnecessary. GE and global trade are regarded by many participants as the antithesis of what we want for the future.

Some participants mentioned specific GE activities in their country which prompted them to get involved e.g. Monsanto's Bt potato cultivation and threat to organic agriculture in Georgia, and Pioneer's activities in Croatia.

The fact that this was a 'winnable' campaign was cited as another reason for joining the GE protests.

3.4 Expectations from the Skill-share

Unsurprisingly, many Westerners came to find out what is happening on GE in the East, and the Easterners to find out about GE protests in Western Europe.

Participants wanted to find out more about GE, e.g. which foods are genetically engineered, to learn tools for campaigning on GE, for good ideas and to meet other people working on this issue.

One of the very specific outcomes, was to create a network, so that the movement can become stronger and to get several good campaigns started in the CEE-NIS region. One participant was also there to film parts of the skill-share and interview participants, as part of a film about GE protests worldwide, and the people behind them.

3.5 The Advantages of GE - Fact or Fiction?

This learning was facilitated by staging a televised panel discussion on the pros and cons of GE. Panel members could change

during the debate, as participants felt the need to contribute or refute an argument.

On the pro-GE panel, we had industry, represented by a pharmaceutical company and the agro-biotech giant, Monsanto, as well as scientists. The opponents were represented by environmentalists and organic farmers.

The main arguments for promoting GE were:

- a solution to world hunger, caused by population growth;
- the environmental benefits of GE agriculture;
- the dependence of progress on science and technology;
- creation of new jobs;
- loss of investment opportunities, *'If we don't embrace GE, other countries will benefit'* or *'Industry will leave our country creating economic crisis and unemployment'*;
- its use in pharmaceutical production e.g. through 'pharming', by engineering plants, such as fruit, to produce antibiotics, for instance, and health care e.g. for xenotransplantation.

From the opponents of GE, we heard:

- the creation of organisms is God's job;
- The cause of hunger is not population growth. The roots of hunger lie in loss of land ownership, poor infrastructure and food distribution, wars and global inequity - problems which cannot be remedied by GE food;
- GE addresses only the symptoms of problems, not their source;
- We don't need GE food. Most of the present applications of GE to agriculture eg. herbicide resistance, prolonging shelf life, are of no benefit to the consumer, and serve only to increase the profits of the producers and retailers. Indeed, herbicide resistant crops are likely to see more liberal use of herbicides and greater contamination of groundwater;
- GE food raises questions of democracy and consumer choice. Most consumers in Europe do not want GE food, but are given no choice;
- Indigenous cultures have survived for millennia without GE;
- Sustainability, which is where we all agree we want to be heading, rests on three pillars: economic efficiency, ecological security and social equity. GE could have enormous socio-economic impacts, through the right of corporations to patent and own life. It highlights

questions of: Who controls what, for whose benefit?

- Xenotransplantation i.e. the transplanting of animal organs into humans, can result in animal diseases crossing over to humans.

The pro-GE panel came over stronger. They were better organised and seemed to have very well rehearsed arguments. They also outnumbered the GE opponents by 6 vs. 3 panelists throughout most of this lively debate. A full list of the pros and cons of GE presented in the debate is attached as Annex 3.

3.6 What are the Dangers of GE Food and Agriculture?

This question was explored using an analysis tree, with participants working in two groups. The starting point of the tree was **'unsustainable agricultural policy'**, then more specifically, the **'unsustainable EU agricultural policy'** with its Common Agricultural Policy and environmentally perverse subsidies, and then finally **'genetic engineering of food'**. The two analysis trees drawn up by the groups have been integrated into one, which is attached in Annex 4.

The key themes and sub-themes that came out of the analysis are summarised below:

- **Unnecessary** - enough food, problems with subsidies and distribution;
- **Playing God** - patenting of life, unnatural, corporate 'greenwash' about 'feeding the world';
- **Death of Biodiversity** - disease due to monocultures, the greater the number of species, the healthier and more resistant the ecosystem to disease and stresses;
- **Health effects** - allergies, new kinds of diseases;
- **Uncontrollable, untestable** - millenia-old species die, GMOs are new to nature and can be like a virus epidemic, GMOs do not have a half-life;
- **Transnational corporations (TNCs) control seed production** - local agricultural production dies, no diversity in agricultural production, small farmers are hurt;
- **Not tested properly, but on the market** - we don't know what we are eating, market choice disappears, burden of proof of safety should be on the TNC;

- **Increased use of chemicals** - damages human and environmental health, contaminates water, soil etc.;
- **End of traditional agriculture** - local ownership of food supply.

3.7 What is happening in CEE and NIS?

This question was answered by a series of short presentations by participants from the region already working on genetic engineering. Each presentation was followed by a question and answer session.

To get an overall picture of what is happening in this region, a wall chart was displayed and participants invited to answer the questions on GE activities and imports in their country. This is attached as Annex 5.

office in Hungary, and a campaign opposing genetic engineering. There was not.

First Step - Building an NGO Alliance

However, ANPED's six-country pan-European Sustainable Product Campaign, 'Sustainable Menus for the Next Millennium', focusing on food, had just started. Within this framework, an alliance of NGOs was created to promote a sustainable food culture, by using genetic engineering as the hook to catch the public's attention.

The first part of the GE campaign was research to find out about domestic releases of genetically engineered organisms (GEOs), the activities of transnational companies, such as Monsanto and AgrEvo in Hungary, domestic production of glyphosate (the main ingredient in Monsanto's herbicide, Roundup) and viable alternatives to genetically engineered (GE) crops.

The four main elements of the campaign

From left to right: Laszlo Pernecky, Dan Swartz, Maka Jorjadze, Zoe Elford, György Stuber, Iza Kruszewska, Dusanka Ljumovic.

3.7.1 Hungary - Veronika Mora, ETK

Until late 1996, there was very little interest in the Hungarian NGO community to work on genetic engineering. A phone call to the Energy Club from Burson Marsteller, the international public relations company, representing, amongst others, EuropaBio, (the association of biotechnology firms) changed that. Burson Marsteller were enquiring whether there was a Greenpeace

have been:

- the production of GE crops in Hungary without any controls or public participation in decision-making;
- the import of genetically-engineered crops and products;
- the Hungarian production of agrochemicals, such as glyphosates, meant to be used in conjunction with some genetically engineered crops; and
- supporting organic agriculture and local sourcing.

The central goal of the campaign is to stop the release and trade of GEOs in Hungary,

with the message, "We do not know what we are eating."

In March 1997, during the annual national NGO meeting, 130 NGOs adopted a statement calling for the Government to:

- make public all information about genetic engineering in Hungary;
- introduce controls and regulation of all genetic engineering research in Hungary;
- prohibit field testing and deliberate releases of GEOs into the Hungarian environment; and
- prohibit all trade of products containing GEOs in Hungary.

A broad working coalition was formed between environmental NGOs such as ETK, Okotars Foundation, Hungarian Waste Working Group, Bankwatch- Hungary, BME-Green Circle, Ecoservice, Ecological Institute for Sustainable Development, MTVSz, and Biokultura (the national association of organic farmers), as well as organic food shops (bio-shops) and vegetarian restaurants.

Second Step - Raising Public Awareness

Until the creation of "Dolly," most people in Hungary had probably never considered genetic engineering as a topic of conversation at the dinner table. Since the beginning of the campaign, press coverage in both mainstream and alternative media, especially in print and radio, has been good, although not always sympathetic.

The public launch of the GE campaign was a press conference in Budapest, held 3 April 1997. It was used to release a Hungarian edition of the report *Playing God - Genetic Engineering of Food in Central and Eastern Europe* to call attention to this issue in Hungary. Speakers included Vera Mora from ETK, Iza Kruszewska (ANPED), Dr. Laszlo Zsolnay (Budapest University of Economic Sciences - Business Ethics Centre), and Dr. Gyorgy Stuber (Greenpeace Sweden).

Subsequently, the NGO coalition have been publishing biweekly press updates on GE in both Hungarian and English for wide dissemination to the press and other interested parties.

Other forms of public outreach have been presentations at various conferences and the preparation of school lessons on sustainable agriculture and GE food. These

curricular lessons have been offered to 500 schools across Hungary. Many schools and universities responded by asking activists to present lectures on this subject.

International meetings on biotechnology have also been used to find out more about GE activities in the region and to make known NGO opposition to releases of GEOs. The 8th European Congress on Biotechnology, held in Budapest, August 17-21 was attended by over 1500 scientists and corporate representatives. It enabled the NGOs to have lengthy discussions with members of the European Commission and genetic engineers from Hungary and elsewhere in Europe. Press releases and information were distributed to conference participants.

The NGOs also attended the Third CEE Conference for Regional and International Co-operation on Safety in Biotechnology, organised by the OECD and Godollo Institute of Biotechnology, 23 August 1997. Activists questioned participants about the necessity of GE food, biosafety, and Hungarian legislation. Lengthy side discussions were also held with representatives from Monsanto, the Hungarian Ministries of Agriculture and Environment, and the Godollo Institute.

Campaign materials include several thousand A5 leaflets entitled: *Genetikai Kiserlet - Ne Vedd Be!* (Eng. Genetic Experiments - Don't sell them here!) distributed through bio-shops and vegetarian restaurants and during street actions. For the action in Vorosmarty Square, postcards were handed out featuring a field of oilseed rape (picture courtesy of Greenpeace Sweden) for people to use to send protests to the Environment Minister. A critical review of the draft GE law and a policy paper was prepared for the GE campaign by several academics and was distributed to parliamentarians and press.

Letters have been sent to the most famous restaurants in Budapest, asking their chefs to state their policy on genetically-engineered food. Hopefully, these chefs can also then come out in support of organic food and local sourcing of their ingredients.

Third Step - Legislation on Genetic Engineering in Hungary

Until October 1997, there were no laws governing this highly volatile research, or the deliberate releases of GEOs into the environment. In October 1997, Parliament approved the new law. Because Hungary hopes to join the EU in 1999, the draft Law is largely based on EU Directives 90/219 and 90/220. Hungary must harmonise its national laws with those of the EU before gaining full membership. Therefore, much of the Hungarian text has been taken verbatim from the EU directives. However, since the two EU Directives on GEOs are under review, it is unclear how this will affect Hungarian legislation.

GE Food Labelling in Hungary

Labelling is to be addressed through an amendment to the 1995 Hungarian Law on Foodstuffs (labelling on packaging) by taking text verbatim from the EU 258/97 Novel Food Directive, including the definition of "novel food." Any food consisting of or containing GEOs or derived from GEOs must be labelled. Although fairly strict, the mandating of labelling accepts GE food as normal and acceptable. By accepting labelling legislation, it has allowed the government to side-step the entire debate about whether GE food is necessary at all.

All the GE activities had elements promoting organic alternatives. Through the national coalition, which includes Biokultura, the national organic farmers association, literature on GE was distributed to bio-shops, vegetarian restaurants and organic markets. A Good Food Pocket Guide for Hungary was published in November 1997, with information in Hungarian and English on all organic shops, vegetarian restaurants, organic markets, and farms from where one can buy directly.

3.7.2 Poland - Margaret Jermak (Green Federation), Iza Kruszewska

As in Hungary, ANPED's 'Sustainable Menus for the Next Millennium' used genetic engineering to alert the public to food issues. ANPED's partner in Poland was Green Federation, Krakow.

First Step - Building an Alliance

The first step was to strengthen the network between organisations who had an interest in preserving and expanding traditional agriculture practices. These included NGOs working on food, academic organisations, such as Ekoland (which certifies organic food), and other interested parties, such as, ECEAT (a European organisation that promotes family holidays on organic farms in Poland).

In Poland, most food production is almost organic and relies on local varieties in traditional rotations. The release of GEOs, through experimental field trials or commercial production, could genetically contaminate these precious cultivars. It could also wreck havoc with the biodiversity of organic agriculture, which relies on the biological control of pests.

Second Step - Public Outreach

In November 1996, GF organised the first of two press conferences. It was held to release the Polish language edition of *Playing God - Genetic Engineering of Food in CEE* and coincided with negotiations being held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, on the a Biosafety Protocol, being agreed under the Convention on Biological Diversity. It also coincided with the arrival of the first harvest of genetically engineered soybeans from the US to Europe. The release of the report sparked a huge debate on the subject in the Polish media and initiated communications within and between the Environment, Health and Agriculture Ministries on the issue of GE food.

The second press conference, in December 1996, was called to blow the whistle on a ship carrying the first shipment of genetically engineered (GE) corn from US to Poland, which was already unloading its cargo in the port of Szczecin. This issue needed to be raised in Poland where there are still no regulations that even mention GE food, let alone requirements for labelling.

GE as a Right to Know Campaign

One of the political hooks being used to campaign on genetic engineering in food and agriculture in Poland is right to know. Poland is faced with two threats: first, imports of genetically engineered (GE) crops from the US and second, their own domestic genetic experiments. Both are taking place

with no legal controls, no procedures for public consultation and no requirements for labelling of foods already containing genetically engineered ingredients.

In June, GF organised a parliamentary debate on GEOs and food, together with a political party, the Freedom Union's Ecological forum. This debate and other lobbying activities have resulted in an amendment to the Environmental Protection Law, which is to include regulations on GEOs, their release and labelling.

During its annual congress in August 1997, in Miedzyrzecze, the Green Federation prepared, together with ECEAT, an "Open Letter to Polish Political Parties and Social Organisations Regarding the State of Polish Agriculture". An excerpt from this letter reads: *We (Poles) need a conscious policy which supports farmers in producing organic food and the sale and promotion of such products. New and independent workplaces could be created, instead of unemployment, overpopulated cities and related problems. Such a policy could give our country authentic economic independence based on a healthy environment and fertile land, instead of one based on chemicals and harmful food "factories"..... All of these factors will support the sustainable development of the country, based on the most fundamental one: healthy agriculture.*

The GF Annual Congress was also used to disseminate the achievements of the GE campaign to other groups and to offer them possibilities for joining this work. This resulted in invitations to speak at local GF meetings.

In September 1997, GF organised NGO participation in the Annual Conference of the Polish Healthy Cities Network, which took place in Rydzyna. Three NGO working on food issues participated in the conference and made presentations. These included the work of the Polish Ecological Club (PKE), Gliwice chapter, to create a demand for organic food in urban and heavily industrialised areas, EKOLAND and GF, who made a presentation on co-operation between local organic food 'consumer' cities and 'producer villages'.

The campaign has prepared many articles translated from materials distributed by Genetech International, an e-mail discussion list serving people working on various agricultural issues, including the BSE crisis, genetic engineering and the reform of the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). The

dissemination of this information has resulted in many articles on Polish agriculture.

Third Step - Targeting Transnational Corporations

Producers and retailers are another force for change. They are particularly sensitive to consumer pressure. In Poland, the GE campaign worked with a dairy co-operative in developing a label for their butter, which informed consumers that it contained no genetically modified ingredients (as opposed to margarine which can contain GE soybean or maize oil). They also contacted large producers and retailers, including Nestle and Unilever, to find out about their policy with respect to the use of GE food and its labelling.

Fourth Step - Legislation

One concrete outcome of the GE campaign has been amendments introduced to various Polish laws, including the Act on the Protection and Shaping of the Environment. The latter, was introduced 29 August 1997 and provides a framework for regulating GE activities in Poland. It requires that the Ministry of Environment grant permits prior to any releases of GEOs, based on risk assessments. It also requires that products containing GEOs be labelled. However, the specific rules and procedures have still to be prepared.

3.7.3 Georgia - Maka Jorjadze, ELKANA

Maka prepared a paper on the story whose key players were Monsanto, GE (Bt) potato cultivation, the Georgian Ministry of Agriculture and the EU's TACIS aid programme (Technical Assistance to CIS). An article, based on this paper, has been prepared for the next issue of ANPED's newsletter. It is attached as Annex 6. An abridged version of this article is to be featured in the Friends of the Earth Europe newsletter 'Participate'.

The GE campaign was launched in August 1996 when the Georgian Greens and the Biological Farming Association, ELKANA organised a conference together with representatives of the Parliamentary

Committees on Environment and Agriculture. The conference, entitled '*Genetic Engineering: Opportunities and Risks*' was prompted by news in June 1996, that three regions of Georgia had sown Monsanto's GE potatoes.

The conference passed a resolution demanding a ban on the introduction and cultivation of GE crops, which was forwarded to the Ministry of Agriculture. Despite these calls, cultivation of the Bt potatoes

According to official information, in 1997, 142 ha.!!! of Bt potatoes were undergoing field trials in the Tsalka region, and on smaller 0,5 ha. plots of the State Breeding Stations in the Akhaltsikhe, Tetrtskaro and Tsalka regions. Unofficial sources, however, state that 100 ha. of Bt potatoes were also cultivated in the Aspindza region, on the southern border. Elkana has also found private farms there growing Bt potatoes.

Although there is still no legislation to regulate GE activities in Georgia, the campaign has succeeded in stopping other GE crops from being introduced. Ministry of Environment officials have started work on a Biosafety Regulation and the Agriculture Ministry has become interested in organic farming and the revival of indigenous species and varieties. The campaign goal is to ensure that conservation of biodiversity - and not genetic engineering - will be the key to developing sustainable agriculture in Georgia.

Maka Jorjadze (Elkana, Georgia) explains to György Stuber (Greenpeace Sweden) the problems in Georgia with Monsanto's RT

continued.

So, Elkana together with the Georgia Greens decided to start a public awareness campaign, by organising press conferences, meetings, giving interviews to the media and writing scientific articles. They used the Global Days of Action Against Biotechnology, 20-27 April 1997, to orchestrate press events to publicise this issue. The press quoted consumers' reactions to Monsanto's Bt potatoes, aptly summarised by the quote: '*We don't want potatoes that even Colorado beetles do not want to eat*'.

In April 1996, a joint meeting of the Environment and Agriculture Parliamentary Committees agreed '*to ban the import and cultivation of GE products in Georgia until proper legislation is in place*'.

Despite this decision, Bt potatoes continued to be tested and cultivated in Georgia.

DAY 2

4 Genetic Engineering Examined

The day started with a short energiser with participants in the roles of either activists, Roundup (Monsanto trade name for glyphosate herbicide) or Roundup-resistant GE soybeans each trying to resist each other.

Next, we heard two short presentations, each followed by questions and discussion.

4.1 GE Food - GE Soybeans, Maize and Now Rape

Ricarda Steinbrecher, Women's Environmental Network, UK, examined first the GE products on the European market

and then the crops which are both to be sold and grown commercially in Europe.

She presented a history of the first GE crops to arrive in Europe. These were Monsanto's Roundup Ready Soybeans, resistant to Monsanto's glyphosate-based herbicide, Roundup. The GE soybeans contain sequences from three different genes: from petunia, a bacteria and a virus.

Another early GE product on the European market was the Novartis (formerly Ciba Geigy) Bt maize. The Novartis maize has three foreign gene sequences:

- A bacterial gene to make the plant resistant to the herbicide glyphosynate (trade name, Basta);
- The BT toxin gene derived from the bacteria, *Bacillus thuringensis*, which enables the plant to kill insects;
- A fully functional bacterial antibiotic resistance gene for Ampicillin, used as a marker.

The first harvest of these crops took place in the US in autumn 1996 and the first shipments arrived in Europe in December 1996. Because producers, such as Monsanto, successfully resisted attempts to segregate the GE harvest from the conventional one, any shipment of soybeans or maize from the US will be genetically contaminated.

Another GE product on the European market is Zeneca's GE tomato, designed to be more squash-proof. In Europe, Zeneca owns the tomato for use only for processing. Calgene (now part of the Monsanto empire) grows the tomato in the US.

Crops which are scheduled to be grown commercially in Europe include GE maize and oilseed rape. In France, where the maize was to be grown, farmers' protests ended up in court, and although the court case was lost, public support was won.

The GE rape, owned by PGS (Plant Genetic Systems) is glyphosynate-resistant and male sterile. It was to have been grown in Europe in 1998. Within the EU, the UK government was responsible for getting the GE rape onto the EU Seed List. Fortunately, following opposition from organisations like English Nature, who were concerned about cross-pollination of the GE rape with its weedy relatives and the emergence of herbicide-resistant weeds, the UK failed to get rape on the Seed List. Europe is the centre of biodiversity for the large *Brassica* family to

which rape belongs (also cabbage, broccoli, brussels sprouts). So, there are many 'weeds' which belong to the same family. Clearly, herbicide resistance could be spread via wind and insect pollination from the GE rape to other plants and weeds of the *Brassica* family.

4.2 Patenting of Life - The EU Patenting Directive

- Zoe Elford, Genetic Engineering Network, UK and Robert Vint, Religious Education and Environment Programme (REEP)

Zoe explained how the patenting of living organisms is the privatisation of nature, which turns living plants and animals into commodities. The patenting of life is the driving force of genetic engineering, by enabling monopoly control over the genetic composition of the world. Campaigns against the EU's patenting Directive argue that patenting regimes were developed to deal with 'inventions' and technical procedures, and not 'discoveries' and biological materials and life forms. In other words, patenting was designed for the invention of the mouse trap, not for the mouse itself.

Zoe described how the major pharmaceutical companies, such as Smithkline Beecham, had funded pro-patenting campaigns by patient groups e.g. parents of children with cystic fibrosis, AIDS patients etc. The strategy of the health care industry has been to mislead Members of the European Parliament into believing that without patents, there could be no cure. She gave an overview of the provisions of the EU Patenting Directive, to be voted on in May 1998, and highlighted the problems that opponents have with the Directive.

Robert used his presentation to help Eastern Europeans to find ways to involve the major religious communities in the public debate about the use of biotechnology. Information was provided about various teachings, moral perspectives and spiritual values that related to the issue, together with a report of the main concerns about genetic engineering, patenting and labelling that had been expressed by religious organisations in Britain and Western Europe - specifically the Church of Scotland and the Reformed Synagogues of Great Britain (RSGB).

Robert expressed the view that religious organisations were able to ask fundamental questions about ethics, consumerism and reverence for life whereas secular organisations were often forced to express their concerns in a purely utilitarian form - for example by presenting cost/benefit analyses.

There followed a discussion about how these groups had been approached, how they had been encouraged to express their views and how they had communicated their concerns to the government and other decision-making bodies. A copy of a letter from the leader of the RSGB to Jewish MPs was circulated.

There was a general feeling amongst the participants from Eastern Europe that the Churches were especially influential in their countries (and had been important opponents of the state in several of them) and that it was important that they were informed about the issues and invited to formally express their views.

4.3 Regulatory Regimes for GE

Ricarda Steinbrecher gave an overview of national, European and international regulations and agreements which affect GE activities and the trade in GE products. She examined some of the tensions that exist between national laws (e.g. Austria, Luxembourg bans on GE maize) and regional laws (e.g. EU Directives) and the conflicts between regions (EU and US on patenting) and internationally, within the World Trade Organisation (WTO).

In the EU, the following Directives pertain to GE:

- 90/219 on the Contained Use of GMOs. This concerns micro-organisms. The Directive is currently under review.
- 90/220 on the Deliberate Release of GMOs. The Directive is being reviewed. The review is being used to allow FAST TRACK permitting procedures.
- Novel Foods Directive (on labelling of GE products)
- Patent Directive on biotech invention. The Directive is to allow patents on genes, human body parts, plants and animals. It is to be voted by the European Parliament 17 May 1998. (Unfortunately, it was passed)

Other international agreements include **TRIPS** (Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights) negotiated under the **GATT** (General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs), which is due to be re-negotiated in 1999. The **Biosafety Protocol** which is being negotiated as part of the **Convention on Biological Diversity**, which regulates the transboundary movement of living modified organisms (LMOs). Another international agreement which could have an impact on GE food is the **Codex Alimentarius**, established under the WTO (World Trade Organisation). The WTO is a key player in the trade of GE products, but is an unelected body and totally undemocratic.

4.4 Using Regional and International Fora to Highlight GE

Iza spoke about three forthcoming international meetings where the issue of GE needs to be highlighted:

- Fourth Pan-European Environment Ministers Conference 'Environment for Europe', in Aarhus, Denmark, 23-25 June 1998;
- CSD 7 (Commission on Sustainable Development), in New York, April 1999;
- WHO (World Health Organisation) Conference on Health and Environment, in London, June 1999.

4.4.1 Environment for Europe (EfE)

Two items on the EfE agenda are being used to highlight the issue of GE. First, is the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (to be known as the Aarhus Convention). The Convention, which has taken almost two years to prepare, has seen an unprecedented level of input from environmental citizens' organisations (ECOs) in the negotiations, with ECOs being represented in all the drafting sessions.

Many of the issues that ECOs had raised, have been included in the draft Convention, albeit inadequately. In the Access to Information 'pillar' of the draft Convention, we managed to get genetically modified organisms (GMOs) explicitly included in the definitions of environmental information. However, one of the most contentious issues was that of public participation in decisions

relating to the deliberate release of GMOs. This battle was lost in the face of strong opposition - particularly from France and Germany - to any such provisions, and the final text requires public participation only 'to the extent feasible and appropriate within the framework of national law'. Moreover, the issue of 'contained' use of GMOs is left out of the Convention altogether, with the issue only up for debate at the first Conference of Parties to the Convention - which could be a few years away!

The second hook for highlighting GE at Aarhus is the Pan European Biodiversity and Landscape Diversity Strategy (PEBLDS), which has yet to even consider the impact on biodiversity of environmental releases of GMOs into the environment. However, PEBLDS is not a legally-binding instrument

4.4.2 Commission on Sustainable Development, 7th Session

The cross-sectoral theme for the 7th session of the CSD will be Consumption and Production Patterns. The existing UN Guidelines were adopted in 1985 and now need to be updated. One of the topics for discussion will be the new draft Guidelines on Sustainable Consumption. The use of GE, particularly in food products, has already been addressed in the Guidelines, as well as the need for full information labelling. However, they have yet to be finalised and adopted.

4.4.3 WHO Conference on Health and Environment

This cross-cutting issue is to be tackled within 10 priority topics, including Public and NGO participation, Water, Workplace and Industry, Climate Change, Environmental Health Economics and Transport. NGOs have been trying to add Food as another major topic, but to date the only New Initiatives adopted have been Children and Risk Perception and Communication. More work needs to be done to get GE on the agenda of the London '99 conference.

4.5 Positive Stories - Successful Strategies and Actions

Susanne Fromwald, Greenpeace Austria spoke about the GE campaign in Austria. The main protests started in June 1996 when the Government announced that it was considering an application for a permit to undertake field trials of GE crops. The resulting uproar from environmental organisations, like Greenpeace and Global 2000, and organic farmers forced the government to introduce a ban on GE crops.

Later in 1996, when the EU was considering whether to permit the import of Bt maize from the US, the Austrians, along with most other EU Member States (except for France and Spain) opposed the proposal. Most Member States were concerned about the Ampicillin resistance gene, inserted into the corn, since there is already widespread antibiotic resistance, and Ampicillin is used in human health care. Despite the opposition from a majority of Member States, the GE corn was allowed to be imported into the EU, but Luxembourg and Austria, introduced a ban. However, Austria is coming under intense pressure to lift the ban.

Susanne gave the example of Pioneer Hi-Breed, a US seed company which failed to persuade the Austrians to permit field trials of GE maize in their country. The company was forced to withdraw the application, due to public resistance, but promptly announced that it would go to Hungary.

Zoe Elford (UK) described her work with the Genetic Engineering Network (GEN) and their outreach to activists via the newsletter 'Genetix News'. Zoe described the campaign around the EU Patent Directive, whose public message is 'No Patents on Life'. She explained how activists in the UK have access to information on the locations of field trials of GE crops, but how this access is being made increasingly difficult. The presentation included a slide show of some of the most visual and entertaining actions undertaken by GEN.

Gyorgy Stuber (Greenpeace Sweden) gave an overview of the campaign against deliberate release of GMOs in Sweden. This included criticism of the GE policy of the farmers umbrella organization, LRF and the disclosure of GE soybean-containing products on the "black list" (See Annex 7). Actions against the retailer chains ICA and KF and against the oil mill Karlshamn in Sweden were illustrated by slides.

He then presented a slide show and commentary (also by Stefan Weber) of some 80 GE actions undertaken by Greenpeace worldwide.

Stefan Weber (Greenpeace Switzerland) presented a brief history of the GE campaign in Switzerland, one of the earliest in Europe, which started in 1989. He described the forthcoming Initiative (referendum) on genetics and the petition to collect the 100,000 signatures needed to get the referendum.

One particularly successful action strategy went along the lines 'If you can't beat them, join them', and this is exactly what the anti-GE campaigners decided to do, when they found out about a huge pro-GE march organised by scientists and industry. Campaigners joined the march with large colourful banners calling for bigger strawberries and for greener cabbages. The press drew attention to these messages, which worked to alienate the public from science and industry.

Vera Mora (ETK, Hungary) described some of the actions that the GE campaign has done to draw public attention to the issue of GE food.

In April 97, in Budapest's Vorosmarty Square, the campaign organised a street action to maintain the momentum and press interest generated by a press conference, earlier that month. This was one of many which took place in over 30 countries during the week April 21-26. These Global Days of Action Against Genetically Engineered Food were called by the Pure Food Campaign, USA, and included actions in the US, Georgia, Brazil, UK and Ethiopia.

During this action, Hungarian activists dressed as laboratory rabbits and genetic experiments gone wrong, distributed leaflets

on GE food to the public. Posters with a photo of a human fetus inside a tomato, carried the question: *Is this your idea of a tomato/paradise?* (the Hungarian word for tomato and paradise is the same). Tables laden with foodstuffs which could contain GEO ingredients, including corn, vegetable oil, tomatoes, potatoes, soybeans, Nestle chocolate and Unilever products, such as margarine, were displayed to inform the public. Although contacted for comments, both Unilever and Nestle refused to issue policy statements in Hungary calling for GE-free food, as they have done in Austria.

However, the actions have had some results. The Hungarian offices of Stollwerk, Julius Meinl, and SPAR have all stated that they are demanding certification from their suppliers that their products are GE-free. In addition, several famous and expensive restaurants such as Gundel have stated that they do not want to use GE food, that they use local sources as much as possible, and want mandatory labelling.

The other success story from Hungary, concerns lobbying for legislation to control GE activities. Although the new law, passed in October 1997, does not ensure access to information, a database including information about laboratories undertaking GE activities, contained use of GEOs, releases of GEOs and bans in other countries is to be established at the Institute Biotechnology in Godollo. There are plans to establish Internet access to the database. Yet, concern remains about access to information when unelected individuals with a clear bias become responsible for such potentially critical information. It is like letting the fox guard the hen house.

4.6 Action Planning

The participants split up into groups according to countries/regions and issues. The following five groups emerged:

- Georgia, Bulgaria, Croatia;
- Russia, Ukraine, Yugoslavia;
- Latvia;
- Lithuania;
- Poland

The groups were asked to define the campaign goal, the strategies to achieve that goal, the target groups and the campaign messages addressed to those groups, as

well as which specific organisation/individuals would be involved.

The outcomes of the five working groups are presented in tabulated form, as Annex 8.

5. Day 3

5.1 Getting your Message Across

A brainstorm identified the main ways of getting 'the message' across, and which 'message' should be directed to whom. A discussion followed of what 'the message' should be. A list of key demands was drawn up.

Participants decided to hold a press conference on the following day, Monday, 4 May, in Budapest. One group decided to spend some time in the afternoon drafting a press release; another agreed to elaborate a resolution. Veronika Mora offered to send invitations to the press conference. Those participants going from the skill-share directly to the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biodiversity in Bratislava, agreed to distribute the press release and resolution there.

The press release and resolution from the skill-share are attached as Annex 12.

5.2 Networking - Matching Resources and Needs

This session was preceded by an exercise where each participant was given a card with an item written on it. The objective was for participants to match their items (resources) to come up with one or more activities which could be pursued using the combined resources of the group.

This networking exercise was then put into practice with participants receiving 2 colours of cards: green for needs, and yellow for resources. The different 'needs' and 'resources' were then matched. The outcome of this session is presented in Annex 9, along with a list of what participants understood by 'networking' and some concrete agreements that came out of the meeting.

5.3 Evaluation

The final evaluation is presented in Annex 10.

The final agenda of the skill-share was much more interactive than the one originally proposed. This meant that while participants may have retained more information that was presented, there was less time for transferring information. However, several participants noted that they had also learnt new facilitation skills. Some participants felt that the agenda was, in parts, too flexible - and that too much time was wasted.

Iza Kruszewska was responsible both for reimbursing travel and other financial logistics, and for the smooth running of the programme. This was a mistake. Although the facilitators did a very effective job, her input to the skill-share was at times, missed. In future, an extra person must be designated to taking minutes and making travel reimbursements, so that the organiser can organise.

5.4 Outcomes of the Skill-share

In addition to the homework, attached as a separate file, a list of commitments that participants agreed to undertake after the skill-share is attached as Annex 11.

During the closing discussion, participants agreed that they would like to form a pan-European network of groups campaigning against GE. This would require someone to co-ordinate it. ANPED agreed to organise an e-mail list server for the network. For the time being, Iza agreed to maintain information flow among the group.

Although the afternoon of Day 3 was free time, many participants stayed on to work on a resolution, which was included in a press release, drafted the same afternoon. Before the formal close of the skill-share, participants had agreed that we should hold a press conference the next day, Monday, 4 May. The press release is attached as Annex 12. Other participants spent the afternoon brainstorming a name for the new network, but no one came up with anything exciting and sexy.

5.5 Press Conference

The press conference was held in the offices of ETK in Budapest. The speakers included: Vera Mora and Gyorgy Stuber, who both spoke in Hungarian, and Iza Kruszevska and Zoe Elford, who spoke in English with Hungarian translation. Four journalists attended the press conference, but the room was filled by the remaining skillshare participants, who had stayed on in Hungary for another day.

Vera opened the press conference. Iza Kruszevska spoke about the objectives and outcomes of the GE skill-share. Gyorgy talked about the risks associated with the release of GMOs, using the example of the Bt corn by Novartis, Monsanto's Bt potatoes planted in Georgia and the Flavr Savr tomato cultivated in Guatemala, the home of the tomato, where many wild varieties of tomato still exist. Zoe spoke about the GE campaigns in the UK and the forthcoming EU Patent Directive.

Gyorgy and Vera gave several interviews after the press conference. These were transmitted by the Hungarian wireless over the following two days.

Skill-share Follow-up

Several organisations have contacted the skill-share organiser having heard about the meeting through an NGO newsletter, such as Genetics list server, or by word of mouth. They include CASIN from Geneva in Switzerland, Friends of the Earth Europe in Brussels and NGOs in Croatia, Bulgaria, Ukraine and Romania. All have asked for a copy of the skill-share report.

Moreover, materials from the skill-share are already with NGOs in Mongolia. Andrei returned to Moscow from the skill-share loaded with reports, stickers, posters and other campaign materials from many different countries. A colleague from ECO-Accord, Victoria Elias, was travelling to Mongolia a couple of weeks after his return, to do a series of workshops on campaigning for NGOs there. She took with her, as examples, some of these GE materials from the skill-share. Mongolian groups were impressed not only with the form of the materials, but also their content. They are now on the GE e-mail list.

Press Conference: (From left to right) Zoe Elford, Iza Kruszevska, György Stuber, Vera

Annex 1: PROVISIONAL SKILLSHARE AGENDA

(to be finalised with input from skillshare participants)

DAY 1: MAY 1

10.30-11:00 Registration and indicating where participants are on the scale of GE activities

11.00-11:15 Welcome and Introduction

11:15-12:30 Draw a GE Food: Ice breaker and Focus on Expectations of Participants

Goals:

participants getting to know each other

claiming the works space

establishing participant ownership of programme

helping facilitators and organisers gauge levels of experience

12:30-12:45 BREAK

12:45-13:00 Run through Short Program

- determine if it meets participant expectations on poster

13:00-13:30 Fishbowl Discussion: The advantages of GE - Fact or Fiction?

Goals:

- understanding the basic arguments for and against GE

- establishing participatory approach

Topics may include:

The Applications of GE - food, health care, industry

What are the potential environmental dangers?

What are the potential human health dangers?

What are the potential socio-economic impacts of GE food?

13:30-15:00 LUNCH

15.00-15:15 Energiser: Moving Sculptures

15:15-17:15 Analysis Tree of GE

2 groups

17.15-17.30 BREAK

17:30-18:00 Positive Stories Circles

Actions that have worked, and why

1. GE campaigns in Western Europe (Ricarda, Steph, Greenpeace, FoE)

2. The GE campaign approaches and experiences of Hungary, Poland and Ukraine (Green Federation, Poland, Mama 86, Ukraine, ETK, Hungary)

18:00-19:00 Short Presentations, followed by questions (15 minutes each + 5 min. questions)

What is happening in CEE and NIS? GE activities and regulatory situation (Vera, Margaret, Maka)

19:00-19:15 Evaluation: Pie-Poster

19.00 DINNER

DAY 2: MAY 2

9:30-9:45 Energiser: Activist-Roundup-Soya

9:45-10:45 Short Presentations (15 minutes each)

1. GE Food - GE soybean, maize and now rape (Ricarda)
2. Patenting of Life - The EU Patenting Directive (Zoe, Robert)
3. EU and Member State progress in regulating GE activities and International processes related to GE - Biosafety Protocol under Convention on Biological Diversity (Ricarda)

10:45-11:00 BREAK

11:00-11:30 Small Groups by above topics

11:30-12:00 Small Groups switch

12:00-13:00 Presentation: Using regional and international fora to highlight GE (Iza)
Environment for Europe process - Public Participation Convention, Aarhus
CSD 7 on Sustainable Production and Consumption
WHO Conference on Health and Environment, London 1999

13:00- 15:00 LUNCH AND WALK

15:00-15:15 Energiser

15:15-16:30 Planning Campaigns: Introduction of Tools

Goals: introduction of action planning tools interactively, using an interesting example topic, so everyone understands how to use the tools before breaking up into small groups and designing their own campaigns on gentech.

16:30-16:45 BREAK

16:45-18:15 Action Planning in Small Groups
-divide by country? Topic?

18:15-18:45 Break and Poster Gallery

18:45-19:00 Evaluation: Snoopies

19:00 DINNER

20:30 PARTY

DAY 3: MAY 3

9:30-9:45 Energiser:

9:45-10:45 Exercise (in new groups) - Getting your message over to the public

10:45-11:15 BREAK

11:15-12:45 Networking: Matching Resources and Needs

Goals:

- This activity is to wrap-everything up for you this weekend.
- The point of this Skillshare is to increase your personal effectiveness, that of your NGO, and your international cooperation.
- The goal of these next two hours is to help you bring these skills home.

11:15-11:35 GAME

Rules:

- a. randomly distribute cards with items written on them, please do not show them to others yet.

- b. each card has an item written on it
- c. 30 minutes to complete the game
- d. objective is to use networking and create 1 or more things using the items you have listed on your cards. You may do something in one group or many, but the most important thing is that you create something(s) within 30 minutes.
- e. it is not important what you make, but think about energy if possible
- f. The idea is not to match two cards. There are no matches. Use them in combination with others.
- g. Now, network.

11:35-11:50 EVALUATE

- 1. What did the groups make?
- 2. What tools did you use, and what others are possible?
[videos, business cards, newsletters, email lists and conferences, leaflets about your NGO, NGO directories, advertising (what you have and what you need) name tags, t-shirts, attendee lists, talking]

11:50-12:45 ACTIVITY (30-40 minutes)

Goal: To put these networking tools into practice, and make real agreements to help each other.

- You are individual activists from different NGOs concentrating on various issues and using different strategies, but you all have something to offer one another - we all have the same ultimate goal to save the planet.

For example, ETK wants to do an action against GE, but does not have a large tomato balloon, while Greenpeace Austria has a large inflatable tomato, but ETK does not know about it. This is about effective communication and co-operation, matching resources and needs - networking.

- Here is your chance to help each other. This activity is designed to strengthen your NGO and your movement, to "bring it back home."

- We are going to use a strategy called a METAPLAN, or discussion on the wall.

- There are two colors of post-its, yellow and green. One color is for resources, one is for needs. Use one post-it per resource or need, and include your name on it. The yellow will be for resources and the green will be for needs. These should be done simultaneously and placed all over the wall. Move your post-its and everybody else's and form matches as you see them. Ideally, all the needs should be covered, and extra resources should be available. Resources could be anything ranging from speaking a foreign language, knowing how to use a computer, and extra chair, environmental education materials, good contacts with a national or an international foundation...

- When you find some matches, leave them on the wall together, because others might match with them also. Please sit down and discuss co-operation with the person (people) you match and exchange information

Once you have found a match, make these solid commitments to help each other then by going to the notekeeper and having him/her write it down. Find more matches and continue...
Read and publish agreements.

Evaluation: Where are you on the tree - how did you feel about the workshop on networking?.

12:45-13:15 Evaluation: Graffiti Posters

- What did you like best about the Skillshare?
- What could be improved and how?
- How will we maintain the momentum generated here? (What would you like to see as Follow-Up?)

13:15-13:30 Close

Annex 2: List of Participants to Genetic Engineering Training and Skillshare

AUSTRIA

Susanne Fromwald
Greenpeace Austria
Siebenbrunneng 44
A - 1050 Wien
Tel: +43 1 545 4580-24
Fax: +43 1 545 4588
E-mail:
<Susanne.Fromwald@at.greenpeace.org>

BULGARIA

Dian Deyanov/Ivaila Vasileva
EcoSouthWest
PO Box 29
Blagoevgrad 2700
Tel/Fax: +359 73 652 93
Tel (Dian Deyanov): +359 73 24147
E-mail: <ecosw@st.aubg.bg>

CROATIA

Vladimir Lay
Green Action Zagreb
10 000 Zagreb
Ozajska 93
Tel: +385 99 428 371
E-mail: <vlay@public.srce.hr>

GEORGIA

Maka Jorjadze
Georgia Greens/FoE Georgia/Biological
Farming Assoc. 'ELKANA'
Delisi III nakveti 15
380077 Tbilisi
Tel: +995 32 53 64 84
Fax: +995 32 22 1965
E-mail: <elkana@access.sanet.ge>

HUNGARY

Veronika Mora
ETK
Pf. 411
1519 Budapest
Tel/Fax: +36 1 166 8866

Tel/Fax: +36 1 209 5624
E-mail: <vera@pship3.zpok.hu>

Maya Darkhovskya
Central European University
Dept. of Env. Science and Policy
87 Kerepesi ut.
Budapest
E-mail: <e97dar17@student.ceu.hu>

Dusanka Ljumovic
Central European University
Dept. of Env. Science and Policy
Nador ut. 9
1051 Budapest
Tel: +36 1 327 3021
E-mail: <E97Lum41@student.ceu.hu>

Dan Swartz
ETK/ZHABA Collective/HUMUSZ
Pf. 701/178
1399 Budapest
Tel: +36 1 312 9903
Fax: +36 1 311 7855
E-mail: <kuka@swartz.zpok.hu>
Website: www.zhaba.cz

Laszlo Pernecky
Alba Circle1055 Budapest
Balaton utca 25
Tel/Fax: +36 1 332 6109
E-mail: <ALBA@ALBA.ZPOK.HU>
Also: <pepe@rec.org>
Website: www.zpok.hu/albakor

LATVIA

Ieva Zalite
Green Library
Audeju 719
LV - 1050 Riga
Tel/Fax: +371 722 1314
E-mail: <zeme@latnet.lv>

LITHUANIA

Jolanta Rasteniene
Kaunas Healthy City Project
Donelaicio 75a/11
LT - 3000 Kaunas
Lithuania
Tel: +370 7 222 367
Fax: +370 7 209 130

E-mail: <jolanta_rasteniene@fc.vdu.lt>

POLAND

Wojtek Baturo
Institute for Sustainable Development
ul. Lowicka 31
02 - 502 Warszawa
Tel: +48 22 646 0510
Fax: +48 22 646 0174
E-mail: <ine@ikp.atm.com.pl>

Margaret Jermak
Green Federation
25-729 Kielce
ul. Urzednicza 9A/53
Tel: +48 41 345 4943
Fax at work (EKOROL): +48 41 34 30 342
E-mail: <mjermak@eden.tu.kielce.pl>

Magdalena Pawlewicz
Green Federation
78-600 Walcz
ul. Krolowej Jadwigi 14/31
Tel: +48 67 258 4326
E-mail:
<Leszek.551177@pharmanet.com.pl>

RUSSIA

Igor Prokofiev
VIOLA
241 000 , Bryansk
Oktyaborskaya St. 23A, kv.21
Tel: +7 832 74 59 06
E-mail: <viola@ecos.bryansk.ru>

Andrei Ivaschenko
Eco-Accord
pr. Mira 36 (510, 512)
129010 Moscow
Tel: +7 95 280 8067
Fax: +7 95 280 4250
E-mail:
<andrei@aivaschenko.home.bio.msu.ru>

SWITZERLAND

Stefan Weber
Greenpeace Switzerland
Heinrichstrasse 147
Postfach 8031
Zurich
Tel: +41 1 447 4141
Fax: +41 1 447 4199

E-mail:
<STEFAN.WEBER@CH.GREENPEACE.ORG>
G>
Website: www.greenpeace.ch

SWEDEN

Dr. Gyorgy Stuber
Greenpeace Sweden
Hokensgata 2
Box 15164
S - 10465 Stockholm
Tel: +46 8 702 7078
Fax: +46 8 694 9013
E-mail: <georg@se.greenpeace.org>
Website: www.greenpeace.org/~sweden

Private Address:
Ringvagen 1,
134 60 Ingaro
Tel: +46 8 570 277 09
E-mail: <stubi@ebox.tninet.se>

UK

Iza Kruszewska
UNED UK/ANPED (Northern Alliance for Sustainability)
PO Box 12201
London SW17 9ZL
Tel/Fax: +44 181 672 3454
E-mail: <iza@cpa-iza.u-net.com>
Website: www.antenna.nl/anped

Zoe Elford
Genetic Engineering Network
c/o 87 Worship St.
London EC2A 2BE
Tel: +44 171 247 9924
Fax: +44 171 247 4740
E-mail: <zelford@hotmail.com>

Robert Vint
REEP (Religious Education and Environment Programme)
8th Floor, Rodwell House,
Middlesex St,
London E1 7HJ
Tel (home): +44 171 249 4441
Tel (work): +44 171 377 0604
Fax: +44 171 247 2144
E-mail: <reep@globalnet.co.uk>
Website: www.users.globalnet.co.uk/~reep

Adrian Bebb
Friends of the Earth England, Wales and Northern Ireland
74 Kirkgate

Leeds LS2 7DJ
Tel: +44 113 242 8153
Fax: +44 113 242 8154
E-mail: <adrianb@foe.co.uk>

Ricarda Steinbrecher
Women's Environmental Network
21 Tudor Close
Hove, Sussex
BN3 7NR
Tel/Fax: +44 1273 23 11 53
E-mail: <ricarda@gn.apc.org>

Rowan Tilly
Women's Environmental Network
21 Tudor Cloase
Hove, Sussex
BN3 7NR
Tel/Fax: +44 1273 23 11 53
E-mail: <ricarda@gn.apc.org>

UKRAINE

Olga Samborska
Centauria
s. Puscha-Vodica
ul. Krasnoflotska 32
Kiev
Tel: + 380 44 731 9539
Fax: + 380 44 731 9549
E-mail: <uyc@ngonet.kiev.ua>

Lesya Stepanyuk
Mama 86
Michailovska St. 22
Kyiv - 1, 252001
Ukraine
Tel: +38 044 228 3101
Fax: +38 044 229 5514
E-mail: <mama86@gluk.apc.org>

Annex 3 : Arguments For and Against Genetic Engineering

Results of the Fish Bowl Exercise

Pro-GE:

- Improving agricultural productivity, higher yields;
- Creating biodiversity;
- Solving world hunger in a world with more people and less land;
- Crops resistant to pests and disease;
- Large-scale farming is more efficient;
- Eliminate the use of agricultural chemicals;
- This is technology = progress;
- GE is will a key technology for the future;
- More jobs;
- If we don't embrace GE, everyone else will;
- GE not just for food, but for human health care (medicines);
- It would be criminal not to use GE to help our people and our economies;
- Healthy food is not the basis of a sound economy;
- GE is the basis of a new paradigm;
- Human curiosity and investigation is a natural trait;
- Through pharming, antibiotics can be given through food;
- Through xenotransplantation, animal organs can be used to save people;
- Over-fished seas - GE can produce faster growing fish;
- Can use GE animals to make pharmaceuticals for cancer treatment, Alzheimers etc.;
- GE is an expensive investment, a return is necessary;
- GE methods are improving every day;
- Roundup is a soft herbicide compared to DDT;
- Patenting = investment security;
- Farmers are irresponsible, need education;
- Governments have allowed GE to take place

Anti-GE:

- Creation of species is God's job, don't play God;
- Cannot create an organism protected against every stress/disease;
- Reductionist approach - genetic scientists see just collection of genes, not an organism;
- The same companies that have poisoning the soil with chemicals and contributing to world hunger and now selling a new 'solution';
- The real causes of world hunger are distribution, wars, land ownership etc.;
- We do not believe you have our interests at heart;
- Europeans do not believe that GE is necessary;
- Too many uncertainties, too much risk;
- Undemocratic introduction of GE technologies;

- Monsanto also created Agent Orange;
- Cannot show a single GE product that is beneficial to consumers;
- Roundup has contaminated groundwater, it is considered the third most problematic herbicide in California and UK;
- GE agriculture will bind us to the use of chemicals;
- Sri Lanka had no malnutrition until the WTO forced it to adopt monocultures;
- Monsanto has applied for higher residue limits for Roundup;
- The chemical industry relies on medical applications as a justification for GE;
- No advantages of GE food to the consumer;
- What is an acceptable level of risk?
- No long-term testing of GE food;
- What about the precautionary principle?
- GE concentrates power in the hands of a few transnational corporations;
- There is enough food in the world, the problem is political;
- The motivation for GE is money

ANNEX 4: THE DANGES OF GE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

ANNEX 5: THE SITUATION IN CEE AND THE EU

Annex 6: Monsanto's Bt Potatoes Cultivated in Georgia

Prepared by Maka Jorjadze, Biological Farming Assoc. 'ELKANA'
with English editing by Iza Kruszewska

This text will also be used as an article for ANPED's newsletter '*Northern Lights*'

Georgia lies on the boundary between Europe and Asia. Its geographical position and topography make it one of the most biologically unique regions of the world, with almost all climatic zones represented.

Historically, Georgia was an ancient centre of biodiversity with a highly developed agricultural economy. Its biodiversity was the result of centuries of indigenous peasant knowledge who have preserved numerous varieties of cereal, leguminous plants, fruits and vines, especially adapted to local conditions.

Frequent wars, an unstable political situation and Soviet agricultural policy have destroyed much of the country's indigenous biodiversity. During the Soviet period, Georgia provided the Union with just three crops - vines, citrus fruits and tea. The break up of the Soviet Union has led to further wars, problems with refugees and unemployment and resulted in an increased erosion of the country's genetic resources.

The New Threat of Genetically Engineered Crops

With the break up of the Soviet Union, Georgia fell into a state of chaos. With no agricultural policy in place, the country was open to any proposals of aid that were offered.

In June 1995, as a result of a shortage of seed potatoes, the Ministry of Agriculture adopted a **Seed Potato Production Project**, prepared by the Georgian Agro-biotechnology Institute. The project partners included the Ministry of Agriculture, the US transnational, Monsanto and the Agricultural Co-operative Development International (ACDI), a US organisation working in Georgia. In addition, it is understood that there was some funding from the EU's TACIS programme, to the tune of US\$ 2 million.

The project entailed the import to Georgia of 148 tons of Monsanto's genetically engineered (GE) Newleaf potatoes, in June 1996. The Bt potatoes contain two foreign genes, one from a bacteria, *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) to provide a built-in pesticide against the Colorado beetle, and the second, Kanamycin, an antibiotic-resistance gene, probably used as a marker. In a letter to Monsanto, in January 1996, the Georgian Ministry of Food and Agriculture writes: '*Georgia agrees to sow genetically improved potatoes for seed production and will not create any obstacles, not only to using them as seed material, but also as food*'.

Despite an agreement by the Environment and Agriculture Parliamentary Committees, in April 1996 to '*to ban the import and cultivation of GE products in Georgia, until proper legislation is in place*', Monsanto's GE potatoes were sown again in 1997.

The import of GE potatoes contravened Georgia's legislation, which requires imported varieties of crops to undergo a preliminary 3 year testing programme. Moreover, there are no laws in Georgia to regulate GE activities or imports.

Fortunately, the GE potato crop failed, producing just 600 tons of potatoes. It seems that the GE potatoes were not adapted to local conditions and were killed by a fungal disease.

Clearly, for much less money, local seed producing laboratories could have solved Georgia's potato shortage and produced many different potato varieties, which are highly adapted to local conditions.

The GE campaign in Georgia, started in August 1996, by the Biological Farming Association, ELKANA, has managed to stop other GE crops from being introduced. The Ministry of Environment is working on biosafety regulations and the Agriculture Ministry has become interested in organic farming and the revival of indigenous species and varieties. The campaign goal is to ensure that conservation of biodiversity - and not genetic engineering - will be the key to developing sustainable agriculture in Georgia.

ANNEX 7: THE BLACK LIST OF GE-PRODUCTS IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

ANNEX 8: STRATEGY CHARTS

ANNEX 9: NEEDS AND RESOURCES

TRANSLATION

- *Speak English* MARGARET
- *Russian*
- *German*
- *Polish*
- *Translate from English to Russian* OLGA
- *Editing (English text)* ROWAN
- *Speak English* RICARDA
- *German* DUSHANKA
- *Speak and Translate English to Russian & Russian to English*

MASS-MEDIA

JOURNALISM

MULTIMEDIA

- *A lot of media experience + G.E. BBC World Service* ADRIAN
- *Three-Week Press Update in English Schools* DANIEL
- *Preparing Articles , Press Conference* OLGA
- *Filming making video on “GE” (got his camera)* ROWAN/RICARDA
- *Good press photographer* MARGARET
- *Small Group of Journalists* VLADIMIR
- **COMMUNICATION WITH MEDIA** IEVA
- **EXCITING PHOTOS FROM THE SKILLSHARE** DANIEL

CONTACTS

- *Contacts with US/Canada (Grassroots) & UK* RICARDA
- *To be a contact person in Lithuania* JOLANTA
- *Wide contacts with the polish MPs and members of Government* WOJTEK
- *Contacts with organic farmers in Hungary* DANI
- *Contacts with other NGO’s in Latvia and other countries* IEVA
- *Contacts with farmers, GE scientists in Ukraine* OLGA
- *Contacts with organic farming group* MARGARET
- *Eco-activist contacts in religious groups* ROBERT
- *People/Activities* RICARDA/ZOE
- *Offer our resources and help to the people with the common interests* NGO VIOLA
- *Lots of campaigners who can write letters* ADRIAN
- *A few persons interested in subject* MAKI
- **CONTACT / EXCHANGE WITH SCIENTISTS (FROM A NETWORK)**

RICARDA

- **PEOPLE TO WORK WITH THE ISSUE** MARGARET
- **SKILLED VOLUNTEERS** IEVA
- **OTHER NGO EXPERIENCE** DANI

ACTIONS

- *Personal activist – socially oriented imagination* VLADIMIR
- *My body to actions (I do not mean “the make love” slogan)* GEORGE
- *Training & Experience in non violent direct actions*
RICARDA/ROWAN/ZOE
- *Letters and support (International Support)* IZA
- *Green lobby within the country* MAKA
- *NGO capable to initiate campaign* VLADIMIR
- **PEOPLE TO HELP**
 - a) **POLISH PEOPLE**
 - b) **PEOPLE TO COME TO ACTIONS** MAGDA
- **IDEAS TO DEVELOP JOINT ACTIVITIES** IZA
- **PROTESTS AGAINST “GE” IN EASTERN EUROPE** ADRIAN

FUNDING

FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO PUBLISH A BOOK ABOUT “GE” FOOD (FOR RUSSIA)
NGO “VIOLA”

TO GET SUPPORT (“SEED MONEY” TO SELF ORGANISE NGO SOCIAL FORCES)
VLADIMIR

FUNDING
DANI/MAKA

FUNDING FOR “GE” PROJECTS
OLGA

Developing funding proposals for joint projects/publications
IZA

PROTESTS AGAINST “GE” IN EASTERN EUROPE
ADRIAN

PHYSICAL RESOURCES

PHOTOCOPYING

- **XEROX** OLGA
- *Photocopy machine* MAGDA
- *Photocopier* IEVA

OTHER SPACE EQUIPMENT

- **TAPE-RECORDER** OLGA
- **COMPUTER** OLGA
- **PRINTER** OLGA
- **TRANSPORT, FOOD, HOTEL** IZA

OFFICE SPACE

- **OFFICE** MARGARET
- *Office space in Warsaw for meetings, etc.* WOJTEK
- *Base for education place* DANI
- *Co-ordination facilities via ANPED Network* IZA

INFORMATION SHARING

- **TO DEVELOP ACCESS TO INFORMATION** VLADIMIR
- *Information sharing via ANPED Newsletter* IZA
- *FOE international network* ADRIAN

INTERNET

WWW

- **EXPANSION OF COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS** MAKA
- **HYPERLINK ALL OUR WEBSITES TO ONE ANOTHER** ROBERT
- *Set up listserv to electronic communications* IZA
- *Cheap WWW page* MARGARET
- *Useful info's on our homepage* Error! No bookmark name given.
PEPE
- *Internet* IEVA

E-MAIL

- *Got e-mail info list in UK (free subscription)* RICARDA/ZOE
- *E-mails addresses data-base* ECO-ACCORD
- **E-MAIL NEWSLETTER ON GE INFO** ROBERT

MODEM

- **MODEM (FOR E-MAIL)** OLGA
- *Internet access (of course)* ANDREI
- *Access to Internet* MAGDA/DASHENKA

INFORMATION ON GE

1. WIDE ISSUE

- *Investigation help for cases on imports* STEFAN
- *Not too much time but: research, databases, e-mails, infos* STEFAN

- *REC Info Exchange Team does researches on request* – PEPE
- **REGULAR INFO ABOUT WHAT IS HAPPENING IN CEE COUNTRIES**
GEORGE
- **INFO ABOUT THE ACTIVITY OF OTHER NGOS IN EUROPE IN THIS (GE) AREA**
LESYA
- **INFO ABOUT “GE” RELEASES IN EASTERN COUNTRIES** RICARDA
- **INFORMATION ABOUT GE PRODUCTS WHICH ARE IMPORTED INTO UKRAINE, ETC.**
LESYA, “MAMA 86”
- **REGULAR NEWS ABOUT “GE” LEGISLATION AND POLICY IN EUROPE (EXPERIENCE IN POLICY MAKING)**
JOLANTA
- **CAMPAIGNING MATERIALS ABOUT GE**
MARGARET
- **ALL SORTS OF INFORMATION ABOUT SITUATION WITH “GE” (WHERE THE PRODUCTS OF “GE” ARE BANNED, OR ACTIVITIES OF SUCH COMPANIES – MONSANTO, NOVARTIS ARE FORBIDDEN)** LESYA

2. GENERAL/REGIONAL

- *To spread information in Lithuania to find organisations working with “GE”*
IOLANTA
- *Specific info from Georgia*
MAKA
- *Knowledge on some “GE” crops e.g. oilseed beet*
ADRIAN
- *Our available information for GE in Bulgaria*
IEVA
- **INFORMATION ON ECOLOGY & GENE ACTIVITIES BY RELIGION GROUPS IN EUROPE (FOR NETWORK/DATABASE)** ROBERT
- **RELIABLE INFORMATION ABOUT “GE” ACTIVITIES IN CEE** IZA
- **INFORMATION ON DEVELOPMENTS IN EASTERN EUROPE** ADRIAN
- **MORE INFO ABOUT FIELD TRIALS IN POLAND & CEE COUNTRIES**
MARGARET

3. LEGAL

- *Using political processes to highlight “GE” concerns* IZA
- **INFORMATION ON LEGAL SITUATION (LAWS/REGULATION) IN EASTERN COUNTRIES**
RICARDA
- **EXAMPLES OF LAW REGULATION IN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES**
WOJTEK

4. GE STORIES

- *GE stories* GEORGE
- *Greenpeace information* GEORGE
- *Campaign Packs (in English) with Briefings including on Patents (focus on UK)*
RICARDA

- **NAUGHTY STORIES OF BIOTECH COMPANIES IN EASTERN EUROPE, ESPECIALLY MONSANTO** ADRIAN
- **RUSSIAN ANTHRAX STORY** STEFAN
- **GEORGIA CASE STUDY – SOURCE INFORMATION** STEFAN
- **POLISH CARP** STEFAN

5. SCIENCE

- *GMO, PCR analyses (some!)* STEFAN
- *Risks, scientific info by e-mail* GEORGE
- *Scientific knowledge on/about GE* RICARDA
- *Specialists, knowledge – physicians, teachers, engineers* DANI
- **EXPERIENCE SHARING TO OBTAIN EXPERT KNOWELEGE FOR THE ISSUE** MAKA
- **EXPERTS HELP** DENI
- **INFORMATION ABOUT FARMERS GROWING GE CROPS** LESYA
- **REGULAR NEWS ABOUT GE FOOD RESEARCH** JOLANTA
- **CURRENT INFO ABOUT GE RESEARCH IN BIOMARKERS ON FISHERIES** DUSANKA
- **MORE SPECIFIC INFO FOR GE FOOD** IEVA
- **INFO ABOUT INFLUENCE GE PRODUCTS ON A HEALTH OF PEOPLE** ANDREI

6. PRODUCTS

- **INFO ABOUT “GE” PRODUCTS IMPORTED INTO RUSSIA** NGO “VIOLA”
- **INFO ABOUT GE PRODUCTS ON THE POLISH MARKET** WOJTEK
- **MORE IMPORTANT ABOUT GE FOOD** MAGDA
- **UPDATED INFO ABOUT NEW GE PRODUCTS** IEVA

=====

NEEDS - **CAPS+BOLD**
OFFERS - **BOLD+ITALIC**
WHO - **CAPS**

ANNEX 10: GRAFFITI POSTER EVALUATION

Annex 11: Outcomes of Networking, Action Plans and Agreements

The Benefits of Networking:

- Finding resources;
- Trading and bartering resources (information, skills);
- Creation of tactical alliances;
- Exchanging ideas, discussions, brainstorming, using the imagination of others;
- Sharing your resources and satisfying your needs;
- Feedback, encouragement;
- The whole is greater than the sum of the parts;
- Creating connections;
- Involving everyone;
- Using the central point to organise resources.

Action Plans

Participants were asked to list three things they will do on GE after the skillshare. Below find a list of activities, participants plan to undertake:

- Raise awareness about GE - send a report to other NGOs about GE foods;
- Attract public attention by using media - radio and press (write articles);
- Undertake research on domestic GE products;
- Inform other NGOs about the skillshare and invite them to co-operate;
- Prepare a roundtable discussion on GE with other interested groups;
- Design and produce T shirts with symbols against GE;
- Set up an e-mail listserve for GE activists in CEE and NIS;
- Campaign, campaign, campaign;
- Collect information about GE in Russia, position of authorities on GE;
- Sabotage Monsanto's PR press launch in London, May 26;
- Establish a core group to work on GE in Green Action;
- Organise a press conference;
- Start a campaign against Pioneer's import of GE maize to Croatia;
- Lobby Greenpeace for GE work in CEE;
- Send out scientific information to skillshare participants;
- Translate general information about GE;
- Prepare brochures about GE in Russian and Ukrainian;
- Organise public debate about GE

Agreements

- Dan will send Robert press updates;
- Wojtek will let Margaret use his office in Warsaw;
- Dani, Ricarda, Zoe and Georg will volunteer for Magda and Margaret;
- Magda and Ieva offer photocopying facilities for Olga;
- Everyone will create hyperlinks to each others' websites;
- Iza will develop funding proposals with Igor, Vladimir, Dani, Maka;
- Ricarda and Adrian will support Vladimir in starting GE campaign.

ANNEX 12: PRESS RELEASE- FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Budapest, 4 May 1998 - As world governments meet today in Bratislava for talks on the Convention on Biodiversity, environmental groups from all over Europe have called for an immediate moratorium on genetically engineered foods and crops, and a stop to the patenting of life forms.

The call came at the end of an urgent meeting (1-3 May) in Budapest of scientists and environmental groups, including Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace. It was organised by ANPED, The Northern Alliance for Sustainability, an NGO network, ETK in Hungary and UNED UK.

The groups have pledged to extend public protest eastwards and to address the widening gap in public awareness between Western and eastern Europeans on genetically engineering (GE) food and crops. *'Disparity in consumer awareness opens up Eastern Europe as a dump for GE foods unwanted, or even banned, in Western Europe'*, said Iza Kruszewska, organiser of the meeting.

'In Western Europe, people's distrust of these unnecessary and unwanted foods is reflected in the massive protests. This meeting has inspired us all to extend this civil resistance further east', said Zoe Elford of the Genetic Engineering Network, based in London, UK.

Central and Eastern European (CEE) and NIS countries are faced with two threats:

- imports of GE crops, like maize and soybeans, and many processed foods;
- domestic genetic experiments - and a strong possibility of commercial production of some GE crops.

Transnational corporations are increasingly exploiting the ignorance of consumers in CEE and NIS countries and their lack of awareness of the potential dangers of genetic engineering. *'In my country, Monsanto has signed a deal with the government to grow GE potatoes. Fortunately, the crop failed due to a fungal disease, but we are left with unknown consequences'*, said Maka Jorjadze, from the group, ELKANA, based in Georgia.

Another example is Pioneer Hi-Breed, a US seed company which failed to persuade the Austrians to permit field trials of GE maize in their country. Pioneer promptly announced that it would go to Hungary. *'Although Hungarian law forbids these types of experiments here, I am not convinced that Pioneer will fail in their attempts'*, said Veronika Mora, from the Hungarian group, ETK.

The European groups have issued a resolution with the following demands to governments:

The misuse of genetic engineering is a major threat to health, food supply and biodiversity. The unpredictable consequences and dangers are a matter of concern for the whole of society. This demands full public involvement to ensure transparency of information, knowledge and participation at all levels of decision-making.

Deeply concerned at the speed and arrogance of the introduction of genetic engineering we, the European NGOs call for:

1. No Patents on Life;
2. A Moratorium on GE imports and global trade, all releases of GE organisms into the environment, and GE foods, until proven necessary and safe.

For further information: Veronika Mora, ETK. Tel/Fax: 166 8866