

Achtergrondinfo veldproef ggo-populieren 2014-2021

- De aankondiging: <http://www.vib.be/nl/nieuws/Pages/VIB-vraagt-tweede-populierenveldproef-aan.aspx>
Het dossier: <http://www.vib.be/nl/educatie/Pages/Dossier-populier.aspx>
Q & A: <http://www.vib.be/nl/educatie/Pages/Q-and-A-populieren.aspx>
- Mooi uitgewerkt bezwaarschrift uit 2008 tegen de Zwijnaardse ggo populieren, van het **Gents Milieufrent**, met meer dan relevante argumenten voor de publieksconsultatie van 2013:
http://www.gentsmilieufrent.be/downloads/GMF_in_het_beleid/bezwaarschriften/2008/bezwaarschrift_Veldproef_GGOpopulieren.pdf
- Ook het gezamenlijke **bezwaarschrift** uit 2008 van **Greenpeace, Bioforum, BBL en Oxfam Wereldwinkels** bevat heel wat inspiratie voor het bezwaarschrift 2013 :
<http://www.bondbeterleefmilieu.be/theme.php/7/dl/259>
- Toen minister Mangette in 2008 zijn veto stelde tegen de Zwijnaardse ggo populieren, diende het Vlaams Instituut Biotechnologie een aanvraag in voor een populierenproef in Nederland. Schenkelaars Biotechnology Consultancy repliceerde met een **schitterend rapport**:
http://www.sbcbiotech.nl/page/downloads/Bedenkingen_milieurisicobeoordeling_gg_populier_WT_52_3_definitief_10.03.09.pdf
- Voor wie zich nog wat dieper wil ingraven: twee experts maken brandhout van de veldproef 2009-2014, althans op het vlak van **risico-beoordeling naar bladetende insecten en micro-organismen**. (http://www.bio-council.be/docs/BAC_2009_879.pdf)
- De **kritische commentaren** in het eerste advies van de **Bioveiligheidsraad** over de Zwijnaardse populierenproef, zijn grotendeels nog relevant voor de Wetterse populierenproef: http://www.bio-council.be/docs/BAC_2008_733.pdf
- Volgende commentaar uit 2008 vinden we in het expertendossier van de bioveiligheidsraad mbt de eerste zwijnaardse veldproef: "As an expert, I cannot accept a field trial without a correct preparation by a thorough study of the scientific literature. Moreover, if this trial doesn't contribute to a learning process on risk, it leads to a potential paradoxical lock in as eventual positive technological results will be impaired by insufficient knowledge on risk issues. Both learning processes should be parallel and, if not, our knowledge on risk issues should precede technological assessment."
- Politieke hetze toen minister Magnette de Zwijnaardse populierenveldproef in 2008 in eerste instantie verbood: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6q7HAyQ7Loo>
- Een goed startpunt om het globalere plaatje te snappen over **wie er belang heeft bij gentechbomen**. "It is important for everyone to know that plantations of transgenic trees will only exacerbate all of the impacts of current industrial tree monocultures. Essentially, trees that grow more rapidly will exhaust water supplies more rapidly; there will be greater destruction of biodiversity in the biological deserts of trees genetically modified to be resistant to insects and to not produce blossoms, fruits or seeds; the soil will be destroyed at a faster pace by the increased extraction of biomass; intensive mechanisation will eliminate even more jobs; the increased use of agrotoxic substances will affect the health of humans

and ecosystems; and sources of livelihood will be taken away from more communities displaced to make room for even more “green deserts”.

This is why it is crucial for all organisations and communities that are opposed to the expansion of tree monocultures to join in the fight against transgenic trees, to prevent this threat from becoming a reality."

http://www.wrm.org.uy/subjects/GMTrees/briefing_GMT.pdf

- Wiens **belangen** worden gediend met de verdere ontwikkeling van gentechpopulieren in **Vlaanderen**? Ziehier een lijstje kanshebbers, bedrijven gelieerd aan de Bio Energy Valley in de Gentse zeehaven, die de ambitie koesteren dit uit te bouwen tot grootste biobrandstoffenindustrie van Europa. (<http://www.gbev.org/partners.asp?id=5>)
- **Heeft bio-ethanol uit bomen een toekomst?** Een boeiende analyse: "At least in theory, cellulosic ethanol can be a good idea. However, good ideas in the wrong hands can spell disaster and it is clear that this one has in fact fallen into some of the worst possible hands. For cellulosic ethanol to play a positive role it needs to meet some simple conditions, the main ones being:
That it is locally produced and used
That its operations are small scale
That it is based on locally available resources
That the main raw material used is waste
That its production and commercialization are decentralized
That it is part of a diverse set of locally available energy sources
That it does not involve genetic manipulation of living organisms
Those conditions are basically impossible to meet in the current scenario dominated by global corporations. Within such context, cellulosic ethanol must therefore be exposed as a false solution that must be set aside in favour of more positive alternatives."
(<http://www.wrm.org.uy/publications/briefings/Ethanol.pdf>)
- Expert Chris Lang over de populierenproef sinds 2009: " The **world's first release** of genetically modified trees was a field trial of herbicide resistant GM poplars in **1988 in Belgium**. [5] Since then, well over half of the 200-plus GM tree trials worldwide involved poplar trees." (...) "The people promoting agrofuels and GM trees as a solution to climate change tend to be scientists whose research benefits from promoting agrofuels or GM trees. (...) "In these glossy brochures VIB promotes biotechnology, plays down the risks and portrays scientists as neutral experts interested only in the good of society. Meanwhile, VIB lobbies politicians to relax regulations covering the use of human cells and GM crops."
(<http://chrislang.org/2008/02/29/belgium-field-trials-planned-of-gm-poplar-trees-for-ethanol/#more-703>)
- "Besides greatly exaggerating the potential benefits of low-lignin trees, this statement encourages us to accept the widely peddled myth that any "**unused**" **farmland** is better suited to fueling motor vehicles in the US than to feeding people or providing habitat for wildlife. It also ignores the **tremendous quantities of water consumed** by the manufacture of cellulosic agrofuels, and the impact this will have on communities and ecosystems."
(<http://globaljusticeecology.org/files/GE%20Trees%20and%20cell%20eth%20brief.pdf>)
- Een schat aan **infomateriaal** rond de **biobrandstofbomen**: <http://www.biofuelwatch.org.uk/resources-on-biomass/>
- Meer over de industriële biomassa-spelers, en hun ambitieuze plannen:
<http://www.etcgroup.org/issues/bioeconomy>

- VN Rapporteur Olivier De schutter over de hongerimpact van grootschalige biobrandstoffenteelt: <http://www.srfood.org/index.php/en/areas-of-work/food-production-and-resources/biofuels>
- De populieren zaten in 2009 nog maar net in de grond, of er was een **protestactie** in Manhattan, aan de Belgische ambassade. "New York--Today on International Biodiversity Day, **Indigenous Peoples Organizations** along with several Non-Governmental Organizations held a protest against genetically engineered trees in front of the Belgian Permanent Mission. During the protest, a letter [1] was delivered to Belgian Ambassador, Jan K.F. Grauls, that condemned a field trial of genetically engineered poplar trees planted earlier this month in Belgium. The letter was signed by prominent international Indigenous Peoples Organizations including COICA (Coordinator of the Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon), International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of Tropical Forests, Indigenous Environmental Network and others from Latin America, North America, Africa and India. " (http://globaljusticeecology.org/stopgetrees_news.php?ID=284)
- **Documentaire** over de gevaren van gentechbomen, ingeleid door geneticus en ggo-criticus David Suzuki. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w437uQf_A7c
- **The Convention on Biodiversity, GM trees and paper consumption** . In March 2006, in Curitiba, Brazil, the parties to the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) discussed the issue of genetically modified (GM) trees. Some delegates demanded a moratorium on GM trees. Others requested that the CBD produce a report looking at the "potential environmental, cultural, and socio-economic impacts of genetically modified trees". The CBD produced its report in early December 2007. The report will be discussed during the 13th meeting of the CBD's Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA), in February 2008 in Rome. The report summarises the arguments for and against GM trees, mainly based on articles published in peer reviewed, scientific journals. "Considerable uncertainty on the use of genetically modified trees exists," the report states. Moreover, "the scientific data needed to assess the potential impacts of these trees is not currently available." This is because the only way to obtain the data needed to determine the impacts of GM trees is by planting them in vast monocultures and monitoring them for several decades. Such an experiment would prove that GM trees have major impacts on ecosystems and local communities. Some GM trees would become weeds and others would spread their genes through outcrossing. Once this happens it will be too late to demand their return to the laboratory. Clearly such an experiment would be dangerous and irresponsible. (http://www.wrm.org.uy/bulletin/126/CBD_GMTrees.html)
- "Lignin-reduced trees are likely to have **multiple deleterious effects** given that lignin functions in forests in so many ways. Lignin reduction may weaken trees structurally (although it may also lead to an increase in strengthening cellulose fibre), and some researchers have reported stunted growth and collapsed vessels, leaf abnormalities or an increase in vulnerability to viral infection.

Because lignin protects trees from feeding insects, low-lignin trees are also likely to be more susceptible to insect damage, leading to pressures to increase pesticide use. Low-lignin trees will also rot more readily -- affecting soil structure, fertiliser use, and forest ecology -- and will release carbon dioxide more quickly into the atmosphere." / "Current regulatory requirements for risk assessment constitute a further example of an attempt at a higher-order technical fix. This fix is, once again, quickly beset by its own limitations and dilemmas.

First, much of the data which adequate risk assessment of GM trees demands is unobtainable. For instance, in practice it is not possible to measure accurately to what extent GM plants or their genes might spread, simply because of the sheer size of the area which would need to be thoroughly examined for migrants. Studying small-scale, short-term experimental GM releases, moreover, holds few lessons for the large-scale, long-term releases to which GM forestry is committed, and long-distance migration and its effects will be different for every release.

Second, serious risk assessment would exclude GM trees from precisely those uses for which they are being principally developed. Kenneth Raffa at the University of Wisconsin's Forestry Department suggests, for example, that risks of evolution of insect resistance can be limited if large or homogenous plantations are avoided. But this recommendation is inherently at odds with the requirements of the large-scale forestry industry.³⁵ Raffa's team also recommends close monitoring of plantations for a rise in insect resistance, but such monitoring is expensive and difficult in the remote locations in which plantations are often established.

Third, the long life cycles of trees and the range of seasonal and other environmental stresses that they have to withstand entail that any genetic modifications made to them may be unstable. This too militates against reliable risk assessment"
(<http://www.thecornerhouse.org.uk/resource/genetic-dialectic>)

- **"Genetic modification of plants is something completely new.** It allows scientists to produce plants containing genes that could not possibly occur in nature. As with anything new, the potential risks and dangers cannot be known beforehand. Recent history is littered with products and discoveries which scientists assured us were safe, and whose use was widespread, before the dangers of these products became widely known: nuclear power, x-rays, chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), dioxin, asbestos, dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT), thalidomide, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), polyvinyl chloride (PVC), to name a few.

This is not an attempt to argue that science is wrong or that everything new is automatically bad. However, when scientists announce that a new discovery or process is "safe" we would be wise to ask questions about the validity of the claim, particularly when the scientists are funded by the industry that stands to benefit from the new discovery."

(<http://chrislang.org/2004/12/20/genetically-modified-trees-the-ultimate-threat-to-forests/>)

- David Suzuki: "what is the rush, if we have no idea what the long term implications are going to be?"
- "their knowledge is way ahead of their wisdom"

