

Parallel report to the 4th state report of the Republic of Austria  
on the implementation of the International Pact on economic,  
social and cultural rights

## **Social Human Rights in Austria**

### **Violation of Human Rights in Agriculture,**

the Right of Self-Determination

on Food

on Health

on Freedom of Sciences & Research

### **of Bee-Keepers and Consumers**

The information given in this report focusses upon the consequences of a highly alarming global development which not only ignores worldwide scientific expertise and practical experiences of farmers and consumers in many countries but massively and even fatally violates their economic, social and cultural rights by implementing genetically modified organisms (GMO) in food production and agriculture.

During the last years a couple of countries (Austria 2005, Canada, India, Brazil, Colombia, Germany, Argentine) presented parallel-reports on these consequences and human rights violations before the committee. And the committee has already acknowledged these violations as unlawful in the most of this countries.

Europe is affected by an unruly development – more and more genetically modified food and crops are permitted, grown and imported. We want to honour the efforts of the Austrian government to protect his country from GM. Nevertheless there are many further possibilities also für the Austrian government to secure Austria as gm-free.

Furthermore we ask the committee to support and enforce for the first time the demands and concerns of the Austrian government to the EU-Parliament for the planned modification of the EU-seed-guideline. If this will become true – it results in a drastical treat for agriculture, our environment and natural ressources and the consumers – a treat of the diversity and a massive and new dependency from agro-industrie.

In Austria

- The animals are fed with GM-feed in large quantities - research shows massive and even life-threatening health problems due to this – the import from south amerika causes drastic violations of human rights in the producer countries (Argentine, Brazil, Paraguay - rural exodus, drastic increasing poverty, damages of health ...)
- There is no duty for labeling products of animals that have been fed with gm-feed.

- Food with more and more genetically modified additives are allowed.
- Long term research – longer than 90 days – about the consequences of GM-Food that are more and more allowed for import – does not exist. The EU seems to guarantee to live longer than 90 days with gm-food. That is not much – so we are unasked guinea pigs for gm-food.
- We asked the committee to help the government of Austria with its critic to the EU-planned decision of seed-guideline to empower the rights of farmers using their own produced seed in order to be independent from agro-industry.

A concluding observation in this question would be very very helpful to enforce the austrian government for an grave input to discussion in EU-Parlament giving a sign for the other countries to stop the guideline for protecting the livelihoods and independence of their farmers, preserving the diversity of seeds and the human right of food-sovereignty and sustainable production of food – protecting our ressources like soil and water. The discussed seed-guideline disagrees with the pact increasing massivly and only the dependence from some agrobusiness like Monsanto, the same global player ruling also the GM-market. In the concluding observations of India (2008) the UN-committee enforced exactly in this point the indian governmen to protect the farmers and the old seeds reducing the dependency from agro- industrie. Also the most of the other EU-countries have ratified the International Pact for fulfilling also further the economic, social and cultural human rights - what means to stop it.

We are urging the austrian government:

- To prohibit the import of gm-soya for animal – feeding from south – america immediatly, reducing the human right violations in the producer-countries with this step.
- To promote the producing of feed in Austria securing the existence of the austrian farmers – not promoting the import of gm-soya. It couldn't be, that we use our gm-free products for bio-energy taking the imported gm-products for food-production.
- to introduce a clearly mark for all GMO-products and GMO-uses in food for humans - but also in feed stuff for animals and all products from animals
- to introduce a legal liability for agroindustries to be responsible for all consequences of GMO for soil and health and in special as the danger for irreversibly spreading of gm-plants about the hole country about the polls - leading to irreversibly destruction of the basis of life of farmers esp. biofarmers and bee-keepers
- protecting the old and regional adapted seed of the local farmers – which take their seed every year again from their harvest and have no costs for buying it – including also the own reproduction and the independence from agro-business – and hindering the new EU-seed-guideline with all possibilities the government has.
- Promoting the diversity of useful plants and animals, not monocultures
- to prohibit patenting of plants and animals securing also in future the independence of farmers, consuments and food-sovereignty from agroindustries.

We are requesting the committee on economic, social and cultural rights to present its concerns to and also with the Government of Austria and to formulate recommendations to the Government on how to end these violations.

That would be especially a great help for Austria and his interventions against the planed EU-Seed-guideline - setting a sign also for the other states – in the trial to prevent the worst.

September 2013

Dipl. Ing. Volker Helldorff

Doctors, farmer and lawyer for gm-free food

Unterlinden 9 A-9111 Haimburg M: 0043 (0) 676- 729 30 82 F: 0043(0)4232 / 7114 – 14

E: [volker@helldorff.biz](mailto:volker@helldorff.biz)

Christiane Lüst

court action gmos / Aktion GEN-Klage Berengariastr. 5, 82131 Gauting, Germany

## **List of content:**

1) Introduction.....	4
2) Situation in Austria – reasons for the human-right-violations.....	8
3) Violation of peoples right for self-determination (Art. 1) .....	10
4) Violation of the Right on Food (Art. 11) .....	14
5) Violation of the Right on Health of Body and Soul (Art. 12).....	16
6) Violations of the right for freedom in sciences and research (Art. 15).....	19
7) Steps in order to ensure the Rights of farmers and consumers .....	21

### **1) Introduction**

The following publications are giving a good first overview about the actual situation in Austria:

„It is right that the milk economy has completely changed to not genetically engineered. However, this was slightly possible in Austria on account of the mountainous scenery with a lot of grass. I held talks in the whole country since 2004. The fowl branch slowly follows. However, by no means everybody is already moved. For the time these groups have this additional offer only in some markets. Where it is absent, however, still very far, is the mast's area. Above all in the pork mast one prevents not genetically engineered feed with all forces ...The farm alliance in Austria prevents the feed-intensive companies (mast) turning to gm-free together with Raiffeisen. ...

Recently in Austria and Bavaria one had a soy scandal with genetically-manipulated products. Genetically manipulated soya was signed as local and not genetically engineered in reality. Because these comrades had imported the Soya, nothing came to the public. All notes of delivery in Bavaria carried the test-sign QS, but nobody noticed this serious mistake (Cheaper purchase and own control?!?).“ *Josef Feilmeier, 23.06.13 international working group of feeds NON-GVO, VLOG, association food without genetic engineering*

**We are fed up with it!**

**The agro industry in Europe causes dioxin scandals, genetic engineering in food and animal** grief in mega stables. She aggravates hunger crises, the climate change and the farm death. Back cleared regions and monocultures remain. We are fed up with this! We, this is a wide platform of environment, EZA-and rural organisations, as well as social movements.

Also the Austrian Federal Government promotes with our all tax money an agrarian-industrial development which is not sustainable and with which the farmers remain on the distance. The farm death goes on unbroken, the farms are sent in a ruinous predatory competition. The agrarian industry and Raiffeisen were roofed up to now with millions of euros in subsidies what has dramatically accelerated the market concentration – the tallness must become even bigger, the little ones must surrender. However, the chance to change this politics was never better. Now the determining points are put for the agricultural policy till 2020.

***A new agrarian- and food-culture means:***

- 👍 Yes to a sustainable, rural agriculture!
- 👍 Yes to a climate-protecting agriculture!
- 👍 Yes to the bio-agriculture as an example for the Austrian agrarian model
- 👍 Yes to feeds and food free of gmo!
- 👍 Yes to the human right on food and food sovereignty!
- 👍 Yes to a food culture preserving her dignity to people, animals and environment.

**Our demands:**

- Agrarian money binds to social, ecological and protection of animals criteria
- Promote home feed instead of imported genetic engineering soy
- Renunciation of energy-intensive artificial fertilizers and humus-destroying methods
- Reduce pesticide application, protect biodiversity
- Removal of the organic farming
- Nature protect instead of ground seal
- Respect for animals instead of industrialized meat production
- Sustainable food production instead of agrofuels
- Stop deceiving advertisement
- Fair rules instead of liberalised agricultural commodities markets, speculations and export subsidies
- Support of the variety at useful plant places and useful animal races, instead of monocultures
- Forbid Patents for plants and animals
- Prevent exploitation of (migrant) workers in the agriculture

*12. Sept. 12, Greenpeace of Austria, Attac, FIAN, GLOBAL 2000, the green farmers and farmers, milk IG, ÖBV / via Campesina and the UBV (independent farm association of Austria)*

**Planned EU-seed-guideline violates drastic the human rights of farmers, bee-keepers and consumers:**

**Reproducing seed threats to disappear from market**  
Bill of EU-commission under massif public critic

Bonn, 6. may. - In Brussels, the EU Commission has today presented with the reform of animal and plant health regulations one of the most important law of the last decade to the Parliament. For not being 2014 EU election campaign issue, the industry-friendly reform shortly before the end of the parliamentary term shall be waved through. Reform of the controversial seed law, which has contributed to a dangerously high market power of agricultural companies in the seed and the loss of genetic diversity with strict market approval rules for decades is included in the package. Ten companies control three-quarters of the world market; the vegetable production in Europe is already more than half full of varieties of chemical companies Monsanto and Syngenta. Only about 7.000 growers firms provide the very different agriculture in and outside the EU with Genetics for all food, feed, forest trees, agrofuels, and their number decreases.

The EU commission praises the seeds right as a success which it would be a matter to increase. Indeed, the dependence on agrarian chemical concerns might further rise, because the portion seeds of the kinds which can reproduce farmers or gardeners themselves is only vanishing low in the professional cultivation and amateur cultivation. A bureaucratic licensing duty also for rare variety kinds hinders, in addition, her spreading, so that they can hardly buy amateur gardener by now. The fact that licensing is limited to historically occupied kinds and her often unknown origin regions - for consumers absolutely useless – variety-experts hold for especially shortsighted. "Future generations will be the losers", according to Susanne Gura of the association for the preservation of the useful plant variety.

The exceptions recommended voluble now turn out in detail other bureaucratic hurdles. The commission has introduced a niche regulation at the last minute, which has cancelled the licensing duty for small companies. However, they must provide from every kind of plant exact reports on produced and sold amounts. Besides, still open single regulations must be brought in experience for every botanical species, which reserves itself the commission with more than two dozen regulations for the future. Even if the niche regulation shows an improvement compared with present regulations, is valid: For rare kinds every administrative expenses affect practically like a ban.

Intellectual property rights are further strengthened: Now protected kinds should automatically receive the market qualification. The market access is considerably made easier to patented plants as a "heterogeneous reproductive material". With kinds especially cultivated for the ecological agriculture her biggest strength, the genetic width becomes furthermore the K.O. - Criterion made. Bio-farmers and her customers must fall back furthermore on the hybrid kinds of the industry and must give up many good natural qualities of the plants.

Even a new principle friendly to industry comes: Farmers and gardeners may sell no more seeds if they grow food. Only this regulation might rob most small companies with rare variety of the existence basis, and she could forbid this to all professional farmers what they do since human memory: Seeds from the harvest win and with others exchange.

There the suspicion is obvious that the Brussels seeds lobby, stated by Bavarian, BASF, Monsanto and Syngenta, unpleasant competition just not want to let arise. The responsible EU commissioner Borg calls the draught still as adequate interest balance. Massive protests from whole Europe have done him as well as the german Minister of Agriculture Aigner during the last days in the defence. **The people do not want to be dependent on the seeds of the industry!**

The fact that of these days in garden-centers coloured tomato plants are sold, deals with variety only apparently. This are hybrid kinds, under it also such of Monsanto, recently hidden behind well-known brands by business enterprises. Also the marking as a hybrid kind will be abolished if it goes after EU commission and the Federal Government of Germany. Now gardeners, farmers, consumers and citizens demand basic changes of the argumentative seeds right from EU parliament and council of ministers.

link to the petition: <https://www.openpetition.de/petition/online/saatgutvielfalt-in-gefahr-gegen-eine-eu-saatgutverordnung-zum-nutzen-der-saatgut-industrie>

contact: Susanne Gura, T: 0228-9480670 oder 0177-6691400 Umbrella organisation cultivated plants and useful animal variety inc., association for the preservation of the useful plant variety inc.

### Austrian parliament gives agrarian minister critical position for the EU council of ministers

In the Austrian parliament the committee on EU affairs has dismissed a resolution which obliges the agrarian minister on the following positions in the EU council of ministers to the bill of the commission for a new right of sowing and plants:

- The EU draught has to check critically on his effects on the small and medium-sized companies, agricultural operations as well as on the consumers. For the small and middle-class seeds and plant breeding enterprises it may come to no higher cost load and to no higher bureaucratic expenditure.
- Comparable exceptions to the existing Austrian seeds right must be preserved.
- There should be no obliging licensing for all seminal-firm plants which are not protected by intellectual property rights.
- The consumer's protection may not be made soft.
- Preservation of the farmer's privilege: This means that the kind protection does not enclose the cultivation of harvest property of a protected kind by small farmers if the breeding material comes from own cultivation of the farmer.
- The range of application of the order must limit itself to the commercial use and above certain amounts.
- To admitted kinds transparency about the used methods of cultivation and the given intellectual property rights must be guaranteed.

look: [http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/PR/JAHR\\_2013/PK0632/index.shtml](http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/PR/JAHR_2013/PK0632/index.shtml)

This is an important step for the agricultural variety in Europe. Congratulation to the Austrian parliament and to Noah's ark!

In autumn the EU council of ministers will deal with the bill for a new right of sowing and plants.“ *Susanne Gura, VEN – association for the preservation of old useful plants inc.*

## 2) Situation in Austria – reasons for the human-right-violations

Austria has more than 8 million of inhabitants, living in 9 federal historical regions.

### agriculture:

Vienna - The number of the Austrian farmers further decreases, for the rest bigger and bigger companies remain. If there were 239.100 farms 15 years ago, these were in the year before only 175.700. At the same time the size of company of from 31.8 to 41.4 hectare increased, it arises from the agricultural structure elevation of the statistics Austria.

Since the EU entry twelve years ago nine milk farmers have given up in Austria daily her milking stuff for ever. With it the number of these farmers has more than halved to themselves of that time 80.000 only on 38.000.

### GVO cultivation and licensings:

„In Austria GVO have not been grown yet for commercial purposes, just as little there has been no test cultivation for scientific purposes beyond closed areas (e.g., greenhouses). For the GV plants, which have a cultivation licensing in the EU, cultivation bans exist in Austria.

Indeed, the use of a row of imported GV products, for example genetically modified soy beans, is permitted. Such GVO or from them made products are used predominantly as a feed for useful animals. From GVO generated food is only in extremely low extent in trade (special products as for example some imported Asia food). These products are defeated by the marking regulations and must be marked for consumers recognizably.

An overview of GVO admitted in Austria is found in the Austrian genetic engineering register:” **mehr**” <http://www.umweltbundesamt.at/umweltschutz/gentechnik/zulassungen/>

### **Food for our animals:**

**“Austria is importing about 500.000 tons GM-soya (78 %) every year.**

In 2010 were exiled under pressure from GLOBAL 2000 gm- milk and gm- eggs successfully from supermarkets of Austria. Still: 80 percent of the imported Sojas are genetically modified and land in the troughs of the Austrian pigs, chickens and cattle.

Genetic soy contaminates South America. South America produces 52 percent of the worldwide soy bean harvest. In Argentina and Brazil big surfaces of rain forest are cleared to increase the areas under cultivation for soy. However, the cultivation of genetic soy also has disastrous results for the population of these countries. The Argentine scientist Andre Carrasco proved in studies that by the cultivation of genetic soy in Argentina the rates of deformities have dramatically risen with newborn children, miscarriages and cancer illnesses with toddlers. Reason for this is the pesticide "Roundup" of the US-genetic giant Monsanto. Because the weeds become resistant against it, the pesticide must be used in constantly rising amounts.

Also the Austrian agriculture is involved in this South American tragedy. Austria imports yearly 500,000 tons of genetic soy which is used in the cattle production, chickens production and pork production. Last year we have reached that in the production of milk only more gm-



free feeds are used. Nevertheless, our aim is that generally no more genetic soy is imported.“  
*Astrid Broadly, Tu, 12/21/2010 <https://www.global2000.at/news/zuerst-das-ei-und-dann-die-henne>*

Huber: "Austrians want no genetic soy imports" 3/2/2011

"A petition for an import ban of genetically modified feeds of Tyrol BZÖ has ended in the committee “ in a drawer”. With it a big chance was wasted", today explained agrarian speaker BZÖ Gerhard Huber at a press conference... For the agrarian speaker of BZÖ it is absolutely incomprehensible that petitions and applications for a general import ban of genetic soy are pushed of Red and Black only on the long bench .”

<http://www.topagrar.at/sonstiges/Huber-Oesterreicher-wollen-keine-Gensoja-Importe-696927.html>

„Currently become in Austria on an average 700,000 tonnes (!) genetic soy per year sells."  
5.7.2012 <http://www.meinbezirk.at/neunkirchen/wirtschaft/gen-soja-in-oesterreich-d216713.html>

Consequences also for the beekeepers:

### ***Programm to the rescue of the bee***

A ban only of the Neonicotinoide will not be enough to protect the bee, one of the most important agricultural useful animals in Austria, on a continuing basis successfully. The environmental umbrella organisation and the beekeeping umbrella organisation «bee of Austria» have compiled on the occasion of the actual discussions a 10 point programm with essential corner points to the rescue and for the long-term protection of the living space for the bees.

Living space protect - raise variety

Vienna, 14.05.13 (UWD) «bees belong to the most important agricultural useful animals in Austria. They make an essential contribution to the biological variety and to the added value in the agricultural production. About 25.000 beekeepers protect the pollination of the wild - and agricultural useful plants with approx. 376.500 colonies of bees. The respected annual honey production lies in Austria between 5000 and 7000 tonnes, the economical value of the pollination can be numbered with yearly 500 million euros. For protecting the bees successfully a ban only of the Neonicotinoide is not enough. For the long-term protection of her living space it needs an extensive package of measures. The environmental umbrella organisation has laced together with the beekeeping umbrella organisation «bee of Austria» a 10 point programm with essential corner points», says Gerhard Heilingbrunner, honorary president of the environmental umbrella organisation. «One of the most central problems is the strong mono-cultural and in some regions of Austria more intensely growing agriculture.“

<http://www.biene-oesterreich.at/?id=2500%2C1132086%2C%2C>

This tendency result in an increasing danger for human rights in case of food, health, freedom of sciences and research globally, leading also in Austria just to destruction of existences for farmers, bee-keepers or critical scientists.

We sincerely hope, that the committee for economic, social and cultural rights is helping to support peoples rights, which are written down in International Pact.

We ask the committee for economic, social and cultural rights furthermore to honor in his concluding observations the efforts of the austrian government and to support their efforts in case of the EU-Seed-guideline on EU-Parliament with an statement, that the farmers have also in future the possibility to take their old reproductable seed, that they could use any year again from their own harvest without costs, with the aim to eliminate dependency from multinational agro-industrie.

The EU-Seed-guideline aggravates the situation of the farmers resulting in dependency from the seed of some big agro-industries and the following price-escalation of seed, fertilizer and pesticides massif also in Europe, resulting in a further increasing of farm-deaths and damaging of livelihoods of farmers. A further result is the increase of dependency of the consuments from the food-giants, the same global player sharing the market under themselves.

In almost the same matter affected are the bee-keeper, because a decrease of agriculture causes a decrease of bees and with it the pollination and the rural food-production for example in orchards. Also this problem increases just in Austria already dramatically.

### **3) Violation of peoples right for self-determination (Art. 1)**

#### **§ 1: „All People have the right of self-determination“**

Violation of the right of people in Austria

- **Case contamination of seeds**

GMO-seeds are not allowed to be on the market in europe including import. Nevertheless no legal regulations about contamination of seeds are existing. The global trade with GMO-seed, however, results in contaminations in Europe as well as in Austria just now.

EU-commission plans to allow an amount of 0,3 up to 0,5% of contamination, defining “GMO-free” seeds! “It is clear, that the consequences of such regulation will be disastrous. The cultivation in the next year could be fully contaminated by GMO, whereby the farmers would have no information about! The demand, thus, is clear: GMO-free seeds must be also really without GMO – almost to the limit of detection (this moment 0,1 %).” (*“Between forced action from EU and recruitment of government officials” Klaus Faissner in “Gefahr Gentechnik”, p. 61*) In this sense Austria has formulated his regulation for GMO-seeds. However, on the long run, there is no chance to maintain this level esp. against Eu-guidelines. Also GMO-seeds from neighbouring countries will enter by flying pols through wind and insects. In such a way, the right for self-determination in Austria is not given anymore!

- **Case illegal imports:**

Caused by missing import controls increasingly GMO-products, which are not marked - and thus not allowed - are imported. This fact was noticed only after their use by consumers! The GMO-law means e.g. that controls are allowed only in case of indications, that these products are considered to be introduced on the market (§ 101 GMO-law) – but this don't must be done in reality!

In such a way, the right of selfdetermination of people is drastically endangered. This is shown by the quite small efforts done in order to “tame” GM-Industries with the aid of legal instruments. Austria has to assure, that control of import is executed by civil service sufficiently strong at the same time as it should help to enhance the efforts within EU. The final aim is clear: GMO-free agriculture and food, as long as GMO in food and agriculture are not matured i.e. the eco-social consequences for man and nature are not clarified by independent research!

- **Revolt in genetical field**

Felix Prinz zu Löwenstein from the „union of ecological agriculture“ (Bölg):

„Who is working with GMOs is a economic threat for the whole food-sector“ he says. “By filling into another container, at the transport or in factory - always it takes risk to mix clean products with genetically modified. “

Actually in Germany GM-plants are cultivated only for research, there is no commercial cultivation; but we´re importing masses of GM-products. Above all, GM-soya as feed for animals is very popular. (23.06.2010, Südd. Ztg. S. 19)

---

The example Greece shows – it´s possible! The greek government has seen the risks and consequences – and took action: In Greece there is not allowed any cultivation or import of any GMO-products by law. There is even a prohibition of any transport, what means there is also not allowed any transit of genetic modified load through Greece.

**§ 2: „All people can freely dispose on their natural richnesses-  
in no case peoples basis of existence may be robbed!“**

The farmer developed sorts about thousands of years old traditions and about many generations practised methods of cultivation, which are adapted exactly to regional conditions.

Study: Green genetic engineering damages environment and farmers

1. febr. 2013

The green genetic engineering has apparently disastrous results for environment and agriculture. To this result the munich genetic engineering expert Christoph Then comes in a study. In it Then indicates that several weed kinds and mushrooms would have adapted themselves to the new Gentech plants, so that, in the meantime, partially more pesticides would be used than in the conventional agriculture. Also more and more poisons would have to be combined in the plants which produced an insect poison thanks to genetic engineering because pests would have adapted themselves.

Then has examined in his study above all the development in the USA, where the green genetic engineering is differently strongly spread than in Europe. There an "armament takes place for many years on the field" which does the agriculture "on and on in an extreme industrialisation with rising load for person and environment", one says in the investigation

further. Also the farmers got increasingly in a dependence: Because Gentech seeds would be patented, they could not often use simply parts of her harvest for the resowing, but would have to buy to themselves every year once more expensive seeds. The Green politician and europarlamentarian Martin Häusling demanded a turning away from the green genetic engineering. "We must work with the nature, not against them", he said the newspaper.

<http://www.sueddeutsche.de/wissen/studie-zu-gengemuese-gruene-gentechnik-schadet-umwelt-und-landwirten-1.1588708>

“It is grotesque to identify agro industries, which apply GMOs with all the mentioned problems as being able “to solve the problem of hunger”, when they are creating hunger, destroying soils, polluting ecosystems and monopolizing land and power.” („GM plants do not fulfill expectations“, Andreas Bauer, *Umweltnachrichten* 100 / 2004, p. 24)

Developing countries have found out that “GMOs are destroying biodiversity that has been developed during the last thousands of years. Therefore GMOs also destroy the ability of the people to feed themselves. Development policy organizations like “Christian Aid” or “Brot für die Welt“ consider GMOs and the so called “green GM technology” as being contra-productive and responsible for increasing hunger and poverty. ...

In Argentina, are used in soybean cultivation nearly one hundred percent genetically modified varieties. The country is the third largest supplier of soy products worldwide, behind Brazil and the United States. At the same time, an increasing number of hungry people have been reported in recent years.

Already in 2004 the soybeans crop growing took over 48% of the total arable land. Hundreds of thousand people have been expelled from their land. Poverty and malnutrition rose rapidly. Undernourishment - previously unknown in Argentina - increased with the introduction of genetic engineering to 17%. In 1970 the proportion of people living below the poverty line used to be at 5%. In 2004 it already was up to 51%. The spraying of agrochemicals on soybean plantations from the air destroyed the crops of peasant, their chicken died and other animals suffered damages and there were birth defects. People suffered from severe nausea, diarrhea, vomiting and skin lesions because of the sprayed herbicides. Vegetables turned up malformed and lakes suddenly were full of dead fish (*Agrar Info* 160 September / October 2008 p. 3).

The GM agro-biotechnology accelerates the extinction of small farmers around the world. Deforestation, an increasing use of pesticides, destruction of livelihoods of indigenous peoples, small farmers and peasants, land concentration, slave labour, the rural exodus and increasing poverty in the countryside are the effects already abundantly demonstrated of the consequences of an agro-industrial model of transgenic monoculture.

„The arable land of the local small farmers is converted into industrial ... plantations for the export; these monocultures endanger the food security of the people living there. The plantations dirty precious water resources, damage the grounds and lyes this from. Human rights violations are nothing unusual: They reach from the loss of the life bases and the expulsion about repression up to torture and even death. The whole population suffers from the plantations, nevertheless, the women are strongest concerned.

In spite of unequivocal proofs about the serious social and ecological effects of these monocultures in countries like Brazil, Indonesia, Cambodia, Colombia, Malaysia, Spain, South Africa and the USA these are promoted by a wide coalition of actors. This exists of FAO (FAO) and bilateral institutions, the "forum for the woods" of the United Nations, from national governments as well as consulting firm, private banks and developing banks.

The real motive of these actors is easy: They want to appropriate the land to produce around there gainful at the expenses of the population, which is mostly edged out, large amounts of cheap raw materials.“ 21.Sept. 2009 [http://www.proregenwald.de/news/2009/09/08/gegen\\_Baum-Monokulturen](http://www.proregenwald.de/news/2009/09/08/gegen_Baum-Monokulturen)

The argentine NGO GRR and the founder of the international network Aktion GEN-Klage, Christiane Lüst, gave 2011 together an parallelreport to the UN-committee for economic, social and cultural rights - on the consequences of a highly perturbing global development, the use of genetically modified GM-soy in Argentina. This seriously violates the economic, social and cultural rights of the Argentinean Population, Farmers and Bee-Keepers. Argentina in particular is one of the most affected countries worldwide by this development.

Via Campesina Brazil and the founder of the international network Aktion GEN-Klage, Christiane Lüst, wrote together an parallelreport to the UN-committee to Brazil in may 2009 demanding to stop immediately the deforesting of the rainforests - in most cases for GM-soya - and the further destruction of livelihoods of indigenious people and little farmers, land concentration, slave-work, rural exodus and the increase of poverty.

Christiane Lüst from the court action gmos reported 2010 together with the columbian NGO Grupo Semilla on the consequences of the use of gm – maize in Colombia.. The committee demanded the columbian government to stop and reduce poverty – especially hunger and malnutrition. The government has to develop agricultural policies which prioritize the production of food and not for export; implement programs that protect national food production with incentives for small producers; and ensure the restitution of lands taken from indigenous and afro-colombian peoples, as well as peasant communities.

### **Indish long-term-test: “Monsanto’s Genetically Engineered Bt-cotton is not just killing farmers, it is also killing the soil”**

Vandana Shiva, winner of the alternative nobel prize, was one of the first looking at the long term impacts of GM-seeds on soil organisms. She compared the soil of fields, where Bt-cotton had been planted for 3 years, with adjoining fields with no GMO cotton or other crops and published in february 2009 about the result: “In a decade of ten years planting GM cotton or any GM crop with Bt-genes in, it’s leading to total destruction of soil organisms, leaving dead soil, unable to produce food anymore. This also shows that the claims of the Biotechnology industry about the safety of GM crops are false.” (*Press-release Navdanya v. 23. Febr. 09*)

Conventional and biological seed has to be and to remain gmo-free also in future! Seed is the base of many food and essential for the stability of our food-system. About centuries a multitude of sorts regional adapted has guaranteed the human food-variety and security.

**In summary:** in order to ensure food security in the world we must improve the ecological and social conditions. Any short-term increase of yields using purely technical means at the expense of environment and humans is the wrong way. A destroyed ecosystem will not feed future generations. A sustainable ensuring of food supply needs an agriculture maintaining nature in its carrying capacity: fertile soil, clean water and air and a great variety of plants and animals.” (<http://www.greenpeace.de/themen/gentechnik/> [www.greenpeace.de/themen/gentechnik/](http://www.greenpeace.de/themen/gentechnik/) „GMO – no hope for the hungry“ from October 1st, 2004).

In order to improve methods of productions, distribution of food, a better use of natural resources and not causing human right violations and the increase of poverty in the third world, ensuring the use of the natural resources for longtime we demand the austrian government to forbid the use and import of any GMOs in agriculture and food.

**§ 3: „The states of the pact ... have ... to support the realisation of the right of self-determination and to respect this right.“**

Acc. to a study ordered by Greenpeace concerning the legal implementation of “GMO-free Regions” in Austria, there exists a number of competences of regions, even a general prohibition for the cultivation of GMO, not being irreal in respect to the EU-guideline in the release. There is a elbowroom for action, not yet used by regional government. Thus, the federal government of Austria is asked, to exhaust all possible chances. What we need now “is courage and political will in order to install GMO-free regions! The preconditions are especially good in Austria: ... the GMO-free Region Austria could be the shining example for Europe in order to protect human beings, nature and esp. agriculture from the risks of GMO.” („Rechtliche Umsetzung Gentechnik-freier Zonen in den Bundesländern Österreichs“, Greenpeace August 2002).

#### **4) Violation of the Right on Food (Art. 11)**

**§ 1: „The states of the pact agree with the Right ... on ... a continuing progress in living conditions ... and are willing to act accordingly, in order to realize these Rights“**

##### **interpretation right on food - guidelines**

In the Declaration of Rome to World Food Security 1996, Heads of States and Governments “reaffirmed the right of everyone to have access to safe and nutritious food, consistent with the right to adequate food and the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger.” (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/009/y9825e/y9825e00.pdf>)

The **guidelines of FAO** from November 2004 are written down for the support of a step-by-step realization of the right to appropriate food under the boundaries of national security for food:

- the right of everyone to have **access to safe and nutritious food**, (Preamble point 2)
- The right to adequate food is realized **when every man, woman and child at all times has physical and economic access to adequate food safe for health** (Point 15).

- To guarantee the availability of food in a quantity and quality **sufficient to satisfy the dietary needs of individuals, free from adverse unhealthy substances**
- „protect the right of all people on food, which could be endangered by enterprises and individuals having the intention of prohibition of the access” ( point 17)
- States should ..... reduce risk of food-borne disease using risk analysis and supervisory mechanisms **to ensure food safety in the entire food chain including animal feed**
- States should take action to **prevent contamination** from industrial and other pollutants in the production, processing, storage, transport, distribution, handling and sale of food.
- States should ensure that education on safe practices is available for food business operators so that their activities **neither lead to harmful residues in food nor cause harm to the environment**

The *General Comment no. 12 for the right on food*, point 10: “States should take measures **ensuring that changes in availability and access to food supply do not negatively affect dietary composition and intake.**”

This right is not more guaranteed also in Austria.

### **“GM-maize in the food chain**

Scientists have proved, that the genotype of GM-maize remains longer than expected until now stable in the ground accumulating in the food chain.” (*Schrot und Korn 02 / 2010 S. 8*)

The conditions for life – for farmers as well for consumers – will decrease after implementing GMO in food-production and agriculture - led in India and Argentina to hunger damaged existences and collective suicides, because farmers ending in dependence and a spiral of debts don't stopping anymore and reducing their yields. “The higher costs of GM-plants, the increased amount of pesticides / herbicides needed, decrease in yield, the costs for seeds and reduced markets result in a drastic decrease of income of farmers.

The first economic analysis of the situation of farmers using bt-corn in USA makes evident, that the net-loss between 1996 and 2001 was 92 millions or 1,3 US \$ pro hectare!” Farmers reporting about “smaller yields, increasing dependency on pesticides/herbicides, lost access to markets, and reduced profitability, so that farmers are easily becoming more dependent on agro-business” („*Plädoyer for a gmo-free world*“, *ISP-study*, 15.06.2003, p. 6). This report has been written by international experts summarizing the main dangers of GMO and representing “strong arguments for a worldwide prohibition of a release of GMO in the nature for making free a new way in direction of agro-ecology, sustainable agriculture and organic cultivation.” The *ISP-study* shows clearly that GMO is not sustainable in future and indicates also clearly, that only using the diversity of local resources is resulting in a sustainable development! It is essential “to give local farmers freedom to decide, what they want to grow and how they are going to improve their plants and, thus, their living quality” (*ISP-study „Plädoyer für eine gentechnikfreie Welt“*, 15.06.2003, p. 17)

*News service genetic engineering*

<http://www.keine-gentechnik.de/news-gentechnik/news/de/23560.html>

04.04.2011

„Report shows true costs of the genetic engineering

A report [1] of Friends of the Earth Europe (FoE) shows the hidden ones costs of the cultivation genetically-modified organisms. Thus manufacturers have to undertake huge

issues for keeping pure conventional and bio-products. **The results are rising food prices.** According to EU data the costs for the production of feed and food free of genetic engineering can rise **about 13%**. The true issues for goods separation, Supervision and samplings are by far higher according to FoE, exceeding the forecast profits of the genetic engineering by far.

On the occasion of the discussion about the possibility of national cultivation bans in the EU FoE demands to consider also the social and economic effects of the GVO cultivation at the licensing of genetic engineering plants. Biotech companies would have to pay for damages caused by pollutions with genetically changed plants.“

Thus, as a conclusion and for guaranteeing an improvement of livelihood, Austria would be asked to ensure that no GMO will be used in food-production and agriculture.

Like the example Switzerland, Greece and regional initiatives are showing is a gmo-free production possible.

## **5) Violation of the Right on Health of Body and Soul (Art. 12)**

### **§ 1: „The states of the pact accept the right of all people to maximize the health of body and soul“**

#### **„Genetic engineering in food - health results unclearly**

Disconcerting fact: There are no long time studies about the effects of genetically modified food on the health of person and animal. While pesticides are tested during at least two years, before they are admitted at the European market, is valid for Genetically modified plants which themselves produce a pesticide, a maximum test time of 90 days. The absence of long time studies resembles a free field test on the population. At animals health interferences were already ascertained in feeding attempts.“ 25 January 2011, Greenpeace Austria, <http://www.greenpeace.org/austria/de/themen/landwirtschaft/probleme/Gentechnik-in-Lebensmitteln/>

#### **„Danger for people caused by dangerous GM-food-import**

Genetical modified food used in animal-mast could humans make ill” commented the green agricultural speaker Wolfgang Pirklhuber in an actual study. Therefore residues of the weed killer “Roundup” in animal-feed cause cancer and reduce fertility.

([http://www.andrioli.com.br/de/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=section&layout=blog&id=6&Itemid=41&limitstart=30](http://www.andrioli.com.br/de/index.php?option=com_content&view=section&layout=blog&id=6&Itemid=41&limitstart=30) Sonntag, den 25. Januar 2009)

Acc. to EU-right the EFSA (European Commission for Safety of Food) is responsible for this topic and has to control the admission of GMO-plants. Their decision is forming the basis for final decisions of the Council of EU-Ministers in case of GMO-food and -seeds. Acc. to Greenpeace the EFSA is approving plants, “containing dramatic danger and also technical weak points. Obviously the priority in this decisions is given to economic interests and not to the protection of consumers and nature. In case EFSA would control carefully all applications,



nearly all of them must have been refused". Indications for risks have not been followed and admissions were accepted although there was a lack of data.

*"Greenpeace publishes new study to security-risks", [www.greenpeace.de](http://www.greenpeace.de), 23.04.04).*

There is a lack of long term consequences for health and the security of food (testing was only 28 days, although it is known that damage is becoming evident after 90 days resp. 3 years – until leading to death (look next part). All existent scientific results on identified dangers normally became ignored.

A new French study of the university Caen shows now, that residues of Glyphosat, which can be found at the most GM-food and GM-animal-feed being on the market, are harmful for human cells and can even be mortal – also in very low quantities. "Despite a 100.000fold dilution the insert resulted in a complete death of cells in 24 hours blocking the vesicular breathing and causing DNA-damages." (*Global 2000, 14.01.09*)

### **Syntetical GM-sequences passing on through mother's milk**

An Italian feeding-study proves changes at goat-kids caused by GM-feeding of the mother-animal. Using GM-feed results in the found of syntetical GM-sequences in goats and goats-babies. This is a alarming result of an actual feeding-study of the university Neapel. And this only feeding the goats-babies by mother milk. "Now it's scientific proved, that parts of GM-food getting to organs causing changes there." (*Global 2000, Wien, 28. Mai 2010*)

### **Study: Genetical modified soya damages humans and nature**

The cultivation of genetic modified, glyphosat tolerating soya threatens the health of humans and animals, raises the use of herbicides and has negative consequences to the rural population. Glyphosat is the active substance of the worldwide most sold spray against weed. The use can lead to poisoning embryos and failures at birth. This proves a study of the Argentine professor Andrés Carrasco, presented by the 6. conference of gmo-free regions last September. Round 75 percent of all genetic modified plants are resistant against Glyphosat. Therefore the massive cultivation of GM-soya in North- and Southamerica has serious toxic effects to health and environment. (<http://www.gls.de/die-gls-bank/aktuelles.html> 19. October 10)

### **Global 2000: GM-soya in baby-food**

In an analyse - ordered by Global 2000 - of ten soya-products they have found genetical changed ingredients at six products. According to the environmental organisation there is also baby-food affected.

Jens Karg, the genetic speaker of Global 2000, is outraged: "The shocking of this fact is, that in baby-food they have been found the highest contamination!"

#### **"Global 2000 speaks about „human experiment“**

"It's concerning products for babies already just born with an allergy and now being exposed a further risk of health – caused by this products. The babies became a play-thing of an human experiment profiting from only some big concerns" says Jens Karg, genetic speaker of Global 2000.

### **Right on gmo-free food**

Global 2000 demanded the minister of health, Andrea Kdolsky, and the minister of environment, Josef Pröll (both ÖVP) to take care of "that the right of gmo-free food is guaranteed now and also in future." Genetical modified food isn't natural food adapted by the people in the course of evolution. (Press release Global 2000 Austria, 30.04.2008)

The ascertained need for action is underpinned from an in 2012 published study after which were found in the blood of 93% of unborn babies and with pregnant poison materials which are used in the agriculture with the production by genetic food. With it is proved that – against all present statements of genetic industry and politics – itself by genetic food dangerous remains and poisons fortify in the human body – and also already with unborn babies.

1st of July, 2012:

#### GLYPHOSAT NOW IN URINE OF CITY DWELLERS FOUND

A study of a german university has ascertained considerable concentrations of glyphosate in urin tests of city-inhabitants. With all test persons the concentration of glyphosate was around 5 to 20-fold higher than the permissible maximum for drinking water. This news follows only briefly after another study confirmed that glyphosat dirties the ground water.

The last year a publication was also published about two geologic studies from the USA which consistent Glyphosat proved in rivers, rains and even in the air of agricultural regions in the USA. Other topical studies suggest that people take up Glyphosat not only by many different springs, but that it also circulate in the blood passing even the placenta reaching the developing foetus.

[http://www.gmwatch.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=13631](http://www.gmwatch.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=13631)

#### Glyphosat in human urine

Scientists of the university of Leipzig have discovered remains of the highly toxic plant poison Glyphosat in urine tests. This reported the “Southgerman Newspaper” with reference to an up to now not published study of the institute of bacteriology and mycology. Especially explosive: there were examined not farmers, who get into contact by the exercise of there occupation using the pesticides, but people who do her activity mostly in offices. Therefore, the poison must have been taken up about food.

One of the researchers, professor Monika Krüger, explained to the newspaper: „We have proved Glyphosat in the urine of people, benefit animals and wildy living animals, in almost all tests.“ The manufacturers of the herbicide have always assured, that it not reaching the food chain, There are no effective controlls about this.

Glyphosat, which is sold by agrochemical industries like Monsanto ("Roundup") and Bayer, is valid among critics as especially harmful for environment and the human health. It is often sold together with genetically modified seeds, but is also used in conventional monocultures. In South America farmers already died of poisoning. <http://www.keine-gentechnik.de/news-gentechnik/news/de/26027.html> 10.07.2012

„The EU has raised the limit value for Glyphosat by the factor 200 (from 0,1 to 20 mg / kg) with it the glyphosat contaminated genetic soy generally could be imported“ (Volker Helldorff 24.08.12)

The called facts show that the use of genetic plants like genetic soy for animal feeding causes violations of the human right on health – and must be stopped by the government immediately.

## 6) Violations of the right for freedom in sciences and research (Art. 15)

Freedom in research is no longer given! 95% of scientists in the area of genetics & genetic engineering work dependently in direction of industry. In case they produce data and results, which are not in agreement with expectations of industry they were punished by losing their jobs and/or losing financing and materials for further research (*"A film for Life", Bertram Verhaag in "Gefahr Gentechnik", p. 183-186*).

"It may never be a question of preferring one form of cultivation. All systems of cultivation must have an equal right for existence." (communication-concept of the government of Sachsen-Anhalt, from 4.2.2004 [http://www.saveourseeds.org/downloads/erprobungsanbau\\_Kommunikation.pdf](http://www.saveourseeds.org/downloads/erprobungsanbau_Kommunikation.pdf))

But reality is different. The Agro-Genetic engineering is fed up by government funds, led researchers and their institutes being well. A comparison with the year 2008 shows this very clearly: 7 million Euro received research projects of ecological agriculture, during alone biotechnology received 165 millions Euro from the ministry of research. Money of the ministry of agriculture like from the research-fund for energy-plant-research (Biogas from the field) and not-governmental demands hasn't been included here. Already this fund-allocation shows how on-sided they place the Genetic engineering. This millions press ahead the change of agriculture to industrial food-production. In the same time they are lubricant to change university research. Agricultural sciences and biology has been degraded to pure biotechnology-laboratories and public-relation-agencies on the most highschools. A self-determined and environmental compatible cultivation of fields, meadows and pastures becomes pushed more and more in a land of profit-critical romantic.

([http://www.projektwerkstatt.de/gen/genforschung\\_uni.htm](http://www.projektwerkstatt.de/gen/genforschung_uni.htm): Forschung und Forschungsförderung)

„80% of the people .... are against the use of genetic engineering in food and agriculture. ....All relevant positions in the regulatory and technical authorities are held by biased officials leaning to the the gmo industry. The district court of Würzburg assumed as true "that .....all decision-authorized members of the GMO-working group at EFSA are unresented proponents of genetic engineering" (Az. 2 Ns 701 Js 18810/2008)

Like this it's also in reality:

At the responsible administrative bodies, in money-allocation-positions and the great sponsors of research the proponents of genetic engineering take all executive jobs. There are no sceptical or critical voices in commissions and the administrative bodies for admissions and controlling. Since years have rapes removed the stitches. This networks are not the only one but also one of the reasons getting Agro-genetic engineering and their conditions accepted- in spite of the predominant disapproval – directing there all institutional resources of agricultural sponsorships. This has been developed always more and more intensive during the time...." (<http://www.projektwerkstatt.de/gen/filz.htm>)

At a conference in Zürich researchers reported not to find risks using GMOs. In contrary have been reports from scientists, which demanded an immediately stop of the use of GMO because of serious results. After the conference I asked one of this researchers how it could be, that the results are so different. Her answer:

„This researchers have the strict order to stop their studies after a certain number of days knowing exactly, that results becoming negative crossing this number. For that, all reported results are correct - only at real long-time-tests this results would change completely.”

This researcher got a dismissal, because she continued her research – against the strict order of her institute to break off the trials after this number of days - because she wanted to know, what happens after this limit. She emigrated to America.

There „... we find plain informations about different acteurs ignoring the necessary independence, preventing enough transparence and neglecting the active care of controll-tasks .... partly about a long time. .... The .... administrative bodies have followed about years an agenda seeming aimed more at a teamwork with industry than an independent and critical controll of them.

Politics seeming have lost the controll of her administrative bodies and experts in many parts. Just for long time experts determine the course. If politics now withdrawing even more from responsibility about the approval of genetic modified plants she let have decisions, being existential for environment and consumers, to the free game of organised economic interests.“  
(„control or collaboration? agro genetic engineering and the roll of administrative bodies“ Antje Lorch and Christoph Then, April 2008, S. 37)

„With the genetic engineering there is most research money. Our institute can exist only if we carry out the research assignments of the genetic engineering industry whether we do this with pleasure or not. One gets, e.g., a research assignment with the ready result. Then we fix the test realisation in such a way that this result comes out. Makes no difference to us, yes, the lucrative order is important. Should against expectation the desired result not come out with the attempt, nevertheless, we circumscribe it in such a way that it fits“, because today it is so usual from politicians and officials to look at the result with all attempts only. Only few of the called could interpret anyway the test realisation which often states quite differently, so we have a light play.....

More and more topically becomes the film „bought truth - genetic engineering in the magnetic field of the money“. This film shows quite clearly how scientists are harassed who uncover dangers. Now there is the film also on DVD under [www.denkmal-film.com](http://www.denkmal-film.com). Please, absolutely order and consider.

Further announcements on this subject: An editor reports to me, he filmed in some countries in which genetic soy is grown and the cancer rate lies with nearly 80%. In many countries the media reported in detail about this new French study. In Germany is not a single one publicly juridical television broadcasting station which would have reported about that. They want to keep it from the population and calms them rather with insignificant.“ 22.09.12 Feilmeier Josef, international working group Feed NON-GVO, VLOG, Federation food without gmo

„The biggest problem is still that the official departments, farm alliance, etc. with the industry are linked up. One informs the agriculture industrial-compliant. Therefore, one blocks the market in such a way from as one needs him. As a small example in addition a case from former years what takes place, however, even today just. At that time the official adviser of the government packed up his stuff and left the hall. He disgraced himself about everything. This “good turns” must stop. In the consultation we need sound practical people who must be without association and neutral, however. E.G. the boss of the agriculture school in the Burgenland. This trains all schoolboys on BIOlogical farming to make then good conventional farmers out of them. They know what is wrong if they go on the field.“ 22.09.12 Feilmeier Josef, international working group Feed NON-GVO, VLOG, Federation food without gmo

This facts are showing the reality about an independent risk-research in Austria. The austrian government has to secure urgently, that every politician starting his job has the duty to show beeing neutral and not in an association or directory; and an neutral and independent consultancy and education for the farmers protecting ressources and **independent from industrie – giants**.

## 7) Steps in order to ensure the Rights of farmers and consumers

The following measures could protect us already from further damages:

- a. A prohibition of any use of GMO for food and feed until the potential risks are proven to not exist for eco-social consequences using long term research
- b. Accurate research on known damages and risks for health
- c. Long term research executed by really independent scientists
- d. prohibit the import of GMO for feed for animals (gmsoya). About this feed the poisons of gm are reaching our food (Glyphosate) and in our soils.
- e. obligation to mark also products from animals feeded with GM-food
- f. Implementation the duty for every politician starting his job to show beeing neutral and not in an association or directory.
- g. To secure an neutral and independent consultancy and education for the farmers protecting ressources and independent from industrie – giants
- h. Immediately stop of all govern sponsorship of agroindustries.
- i. The agroindustries has to take full legal liability for all damages, in special the liability for the autonomous retransmission about the pollen.
- j. If an agroindustrie wants to permit new products first he has to give money to a fond allowing the state extensive independent security-tests paid by the agroindustrie.

Summarizing it becomes clear, that the Federal Republic of Austria in spite of all commendable efforts has not fulfilled its duties in an sufficiently manner. For the austrian population this means an existential and irreversible threat of its food security.