

Social Human Rights in Germany

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 trend, which not only ignores worldwide scientific expertise and practical experiences of farmers and consumers in many countries already until death, 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, Canada, India, Brazil, Colombia, Argentine, Paraguay, Mexiko, Germany) submitted parallel-reports on these consequences and human rights violations before the committee. And the committee has already acknowledged these violations as unlawful.

Also Europe is already affected by this unruly trend – more and more genetically modified food and crops are permitted, grown and imported.

Germany has already been urged to this topic by the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Human Rights in 2011

- (9) (10) to fully apply a human rights-based approach to its international trade, development- and agriculture policies, as well as in its support and in investments by German companies in developing countries .
- (35 ii) to include in its now available State Report information on its policy regarding the protection of health in the context of food containing genetically modified organisms.

Contrary to its statement in the current State Report, the German government has not implemented these two points. On the contrary - the gene companies are developing new strategies, Germany is increasingly shifting its production abroad, where German laws such as genetic engineering law (for the protection of citizens) do not have to be applied. About the increasing number of free trade agreements with producer countries such as Mexico, Brazil, etc. , as well as approvals for the import of genetically modified feed and food - the application of previous rules is successfully circumvented by the companies. So genetic engineering ends up on our plates unregulated and uncontrolled, not to mention the untested consequences.

Sentences such as "A genetically modified organism placed on the market after the approval has been granted can also be revoked if concerns arise regarding its safety" show that the Federal Government has no idea about the matter with which it is acting so carelessly. Genetically modified organisms cannot be stopped again, captured, withdrawn, denied a licence and then they are gone again. Once exposed in the world they are always exposed and never recoverable. On the contrary! Just this sentence makes it clear how irresponsible and

ignorant our government deals with new techniques that will adversely affect our future all negative.

In this report we will present the current status and the consequences for economic, social and cultural human rights in Germany, but also through the import and export policy of our government abroad. Finally, you will find recommendations on how the German government must act to ensure compliance with human rights. We ask the committee for support.

”
Christiane Lüst

List of content:

- 1.) Policy of health protection current status:
 - Violations of the Right to Self-determination (Art. 1)
 - Violation of the Right on Food (Art. 11)
 - Violation of the Right on Health (Art. 12)
 - Violations of the Right on Freedom of Sciences & Research (Art. 15)
- 2.) Full respect for human rights in international trade, development aid and agricultural policy as well as German corporations in development aid countries
 - Bayer-Monsanto-Fusion
- 3.) Demands on the German Federal Government - Contributions to the observance of human rights
 - Demands of the Monsanto-Tribunals
 - The Pope's demands on governments
 - We urge to the Federal Government

1.) Policy of health protection current status:

Although there is at the moment no genetic engineering in the cultivation and in de open land research in Germany - thanks to a big opposition of the population - the proportion of genetically modified feed and food in Germany is rising dramatically and is violating

- **the Rights on Self-determination** (Consumer choice, farmer's freedom of cultivation, increasing contamination of our habitats).
- **the Right on Food** (the right of everyone to have **access to food that is harmless to health**, the state must protect consumers from disinformation and harmful food, the state must use surveillance to ensure food safety throughout the complete food chain, including animal feed, and take steps to prevent contamination by harmful substances ...) (FAO Guidelines, Declaration on World Food Security)
- **the right on health**
- violations of the **Right on Freedom of Sciences & Research**

a) **Agro-technology and violation of health caused by new genetic varieties - how corporations circumvent genetic engineering laws**

Currently no agro technology is legally cultivated in Germany. BUT:

With **new breeding techniques** such as genome editing (synthetic genetic engineering), CRISPR-CAS and “smart breeding“, seed companies hope to circumvent the EU genetic engineering laws and save on expensive safety measures. The companies are therefore changing their strategies in order to remain on the market. The industry demands that these methods for altering the genetic material of plants and animals should not be classified as genetic engineering and thus exempt from registration, risk assessment and labeling. “The new technologies... fulfill all the criteria of EU genetic engineering regulation...” (Genetical network of 24.09.15). They are not less dangerous and have so far been released uncontrolled or “approved without risk assessment. As a result, there is no reliable information about their risks and no way to prevent their spread into the environment. This means that authorities, politicians, farmers and consumers have no control and no choice. ” (Testbiotech, 2.05.18)

b) **More and more genetic engineering is imported into the EU via feed and food approvals:**

“Currently, **around 60 GM plants are already approved in the EU for import and use in food and feed.** Many of them have never been tested for possible health risks in feeding studies. ” (testbiotech 17.04.18)

These must not be labeled as animal feed. This leaves the consumer no freedom of choice.

“... commercial interests should not play a role in the marketing of these products when it comes to assessing the risks to humans and the environment. But reality is far from this indispensable requirement for independent risk research... There is no research program in the EU that researches genetically modified organisms on the market with the aim of strengthening the precautionary principle and the protection of man and the environment (Testbiotech 21.03.18)

Example:

Approval of SmartStax, a genetically modified maize for animal feed and food. Together with SmartStax, over 9 other similar GT maize varieties were voted on. It was assessed positively by EFSA, although even the dossiers of the industry show considerable defects. During feeding trials, indications of damage to health were observed. “EU legislation provides that where there are indications of serious risks, the authorization of genetically modified organisms will be suspended as a precautionary measure until greater certainty exists.”... In the case of the GT maize variety Powercore, even EFSA rejected the results of this study as scientifically unfounded, but nevertheless declared itself in favour of approval without further trials... Testbiotech therefore demands... a stop to EU approval and effective measures against imports into the EU”. (testbiotech 2.07.13).

c) **Coexistence not possible - contamination with genetically modified organisms is increasing - caused inter alia by the feed transports of genetically modified rape, genetically modified soya and others through Europe:**

- Genetic engineering rape in Thuringian fields. In 8 federal states unintentionally genetically modified rape was sown this autumn (Aktionsbündnis für eine gtfreie LW Thüringen Gentechniknewsletter Dez.15)
- Near the Rhine harbour in Basel, more and more genetically modified rape plants are discovered, which should not actually grow there. (Genetic Engineering Information Service, 16.09.15) .
- Immediately ban the release of genetically modified trees (apples, papayas, plums, eucalyptus, etc.) in Europe and worldwide – also no field research in Germany -

manipulated genetic material is found up to a distance of 3000 km with incalculable consequences of outcrossing. "Since 1998, more than 85% of all papayas in Hawaii have been contaminated by gene papayas. Exports to countries that do not allow genetically modified crops have collapsed. " (Munich Environmental Institute "Silence in the forest - genetically modified trees")

d) Free trade agreements in the EU open market for gene food products:

Genetically modified food and feed, which do not have to be labeled in their countries of origin, will soon be marketed in Europe without labeling as a result of the opening of markets through free trade agreements such as CETA and Mercosur.

Current examples:

- Genetically modified apples from the USA (they no longer get brown)
- Gene salmon from the USA (they grow faster than normal - more profit)

"The consequences of eating these apples, but also the effects on bees and other insects pollinating the apple trees, have not yet been studied in detail."

(Testbiotech 26.1.17)

e) Which genetically modified organisms can we expect in the next few years?

"In contrast, the release of genetically modified fruit and olive flies is planned in Europe. If these plans were implemented, it would be more or less impossible to control the spread of genetic engineered insects. It would therefore also not be possible to "prevent any negative consequences for the ecosystems" and our food. (Testbiotech 26.1.17)

They are also already working on glyphosate-resistant gene bees to provide alternatives to global bee mortality due to the use of pesticides and genetic engineering. This means that nature is adapted to industrial products and not vice versa. And when the bee no longer produces honey and pollinates no more plants because there are no more bees - the industry is happy. This can then produce artificial honey (example China) and artificial food. You don't need the farmer anymore. And the consumer is unilaterally dependent on companies such as Monsanto and Co. - if he wants to eat something. The natural foundations of life for the preservation of food sovereignty then will be destroyed in the long term and nobody stops this process.

Compliance with human rights such as the right to healthy food or self-determination (paragraph 2: "All peoples may freely dispose of their natural wealth and means for their own purposes - in no case may people be deprived of its basics of subsistence!) is then obsolete.

And health? Violations of the right to health (Art. 12)

Researchers like Gilles-Eric Séralini prove in their long-term studies that, for example, animals fed with genetically modified maize, had unexpectedly early and numerous tumors, by continuing an official industry trial that ended after 3 months with no results "and setting it to 2 years. Long-term tests are still lacking - and scientists like Séralini will be defamed and lose their jobs if they do not comply with the industrial requirements to short tests. **These practices have not changed.** Other scientists confirm this (see last report of 2011).

The "Seeds of Doubt" conference in Denver on Oct. 2014 produced the following frightening results:

In the USA, 93% genetically modified soya, 93% gene wheat, 94% gene cotton and 90% gene rape and 95% gene sugar beet are now on the market.

The scientists who spoke there showed that in proportion to the increase in the proportion of GM-foodstuffs in the food chain, diseases and death rates due to leukaemia, cancer, birth defects, diabetes, autism, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's and senile dementia have also increased.

More detailed causal research is not publicly funded.

In addition, there are already many indications and study results on the negative effects of GMO feed on animals. One example: Monika Krüger, a veterinarian from Germany, has been conducting research since 2010 "on the influence of glyphosate-containing herbicides on the gastrointestinal microflora in farm animals... reported...: " It is very noticeable that the increase in cases of chronic botulism in milk cows in Germany begins in the mid-1990s, along with the feeding of glyphosate-added GMO soya". ("Eco-cide - corporations under indictment p. 45). Many other examples are given in this publication (see also our last parallel report of 2011).

This has the following **consequences for consumers and farmers:**

- Sick animals - sick people - man eats the animal fed on GMOs...
- Rising costs (veterinarian, medicines) and loss of animals for farmers
- The feed alternatives for farmers are declining as a result of the unilateral subsidization of the cheaper imports through free trade agreements, the duty-free opening of borders, etc.
- New study: "Genetically modified plants harm the environment and agriculture... more than often assumed". In the plants, which produce genetically engineered insecticide because of the pest adaptation, more and more such poisons are produced. This is driving agriculture "ever further into extreme industrialization with increasing burden on people and the environment". (The world 1. 02. 13). Destroyed soils without earthworms and other microorganisms are left behind. Productive soil can then only be produced using artificial fertilizers for food cultivation. This further increases our dependence on the industry.

Imports of genetically modified soya etc. lead to human rights violations in the producing countries and destroy the livelihoods of our farmers, who close more farms every year because importing from developing aid countries is cheaper, if the follow-up costs are not included (refugees, climate destruction, etc.). The German government is therefore obliged to protect farmers and consumers in a first step to secure farmers and their autonomy in their own country and **thus a regional supply** for our food sovereignty and not to encourage big food companies that outsource their production and destroy local peasant agriculture and, in the next step, the "new" producer countries. (See part 2 of the report). But this is the future of our food security, also for future generations, if there is no change in policy. We ask the committee to demand this.

Violations of the **Right on Freedom of Sciences & Research**

- „Independent science" at the service of industry - untruthful claims on new genetic engineering methods" (Testbiotech 2.05.18)
- "EFSA and industry united in EFSI – A new publication shows close cooperation between experts from EFSA and the genetic engineering industry... The uncontrolled spread of transgenes can cause considerable damage to the environment and farmers...

So far EFSA has never seriously dealt with this topic. If the authority is now also carrying out its work in cooperation with industry, who is to assess these risks independently?" Testbiotech criticizes a fundamental problem with EFSA's independence: "To date, EFSA has not managed to set sufficient standards to protect the Authority against the influence of experts who work in the interests of industry... There are obviously no restrictions that effectively restrict EFSA employees working with industry experts". Testbiotech 24.04.18

As a result, independent risk research in favor of consumers and farmers is still not common practice and thus not possible.

2.) **Full respect for human rights in international trade, development aid and agricultural policy as well as German corporations in development aid countries**

Corporations are outsourcing cultivation and animal fattening to developing countries in order to circumvent laws:

Since the cultivation of genetically modified plants is currently not possible in our country, companies are increasingly outsourcing cultivation and fattening to developing countries whose governments support this. If national laws on biodiversity or against genetic engineering exist there, these are usually ignored. Large landowners are increasingly entering this business, which is at the expense of small farmers and land for self-sufficiency in the countries. Small farmers are driven off their land to make room for the export cultivation of large landowners. Their livelihoods are destroyed.

Poverty and hunger are rising. Free trade agreements such as Mercosur with Brazil, Ceta with Canada, Mexico etc. will abolish import controls and customs duties in favour of free trade. Limit values for EU imports will be adapted to the drastically increasing contamination due to the massive increase in the use of pesticides in the producing countries (from 0.2 to 20 mg per kg for soya from South America), and will not be checked in EU ports directly upon arrival of the ships, and so on.

For example, pigs are bred in Mexico, the number of cattle farms in Argentina and Brazil is increasing at the expense of the jungle etc.

The consequences of genetically modified soya cultivation in Paraguay, Argentina and Brazil for exports to Europe are a massive violation of ratified human rights there. The cultivation of genetically modified soya for export leads to extensive clearing of the rainforests and to the displacement of the people there from their land.

In **Argentina**, almost 100% genetically modified varieties are used in soybean cultivation. This 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 increased 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 was already up to 51%. The spraying of agrochemicals on soybean plantations with aeroplanes destroyed the crops of peasant, their chicken died and other animals suffered damages and there were birth defects. People suffered from severe nausea, diarrhoea, 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*).

"According to official figures, since the introduction of transgenic pesticide-dependent plants in 1996, industrial agriculture in Argentina has increased its area under cultivation by 50% and its consumption of pesticides by 848%". (*Damian Verzenassi "Ecozid - corporations under indictment" S. 37*)

"The advancing 'soy front' drives the former small farmers of **Paraguay** forward. Again and again the settlements of the landless are cleared. 116 million tons of soy were produced in the three South American countries in 2011, almost all of them genetically modified soy. In Paraguay, a country with six million inhabitants, soya fields already account for three quarters of the total usable space. Two years ago, agricultural production grew by an incredible 50%. For the Paraguayan people this means a great loss of cultural and food diversity, with the consequences of monoculture, which is taxed from what we call the 'soy model', in order to destroy the traditional food base of our villages, to force the displacement of thousands of families... All this can be seen as the stabilization of a model on the part of the Paraguayan government that leads to serious damage to health, poverty, loss of diversity and culture, deforestation and contamination, rural exodus and growing hunger. "

https://www.oekonews.at/?mdoc_id=1097405 *Human Rights Violations by Genetically Modified Soy Imports Again at the UN Human Rights Committee 2.3.2015*

"Gensonja destroys our livelihoods" - **Mexican beekeepers** before the end - the impact of genetically modified soybean cultivation on the Mayan communities of the Mexican peninsula Yucatán

In **Colombia**, 70% of the food is already imported - and the trend is rising - rural exodus and poverty are rising dramatically.

We also swap the consequences of agro-technology with plant cultivation in development aid countries: The destruction of soils through the use of agro-technology. The alternative Nobel Prize winner Vandana Shiva has prepared a long-term study which makes clear that the soil is completely destroyed after 10 years of cultivation of genetically modified plants at the latest and can no longer be used for food production. The ground is dead.

In **Brazil**, this already affects an area as large as France. As a result, the primeval forest is being cleared more and more and more people are being driven out for new areas for the cultivation of genetically modified soya by the large landowners. In Brazil, the areas can no longer be used after only 5 years. Pesticide use here has increased by 218% in genetically modified soybean cultivation - Monsanto's sales in 2014 amounted to 70 billion dollars!

Destruction of soils - Destruction of livelihoods - Rising refugee flows worldwide.

A new study shows "...that the destruction of fertile soils over the next ten years will force 50 million people to flee their homes because they can no longer grow enough food. From an economic point of view, the loss of space costs between 5.6 and 9.4 trillion euros a year. This corresponds to 10 - 17 % of the world's gross national product. . . . according to the ELD report, 52% of the world's fertile farmland is already "moderately or severely affected". (SZ 16.09.15 S. 16).

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.

This means that genetically modified soy imports from countries such as Argentina, Paraguay and Brazil to Germany and Austria must be stopped immediately in order to put an immediate end to the associated displacement and migration into the slums, the increasing poverty, the poisoning of soils and water and of people by genetically modified plants and pesticides, which have increased many times over in connection with genetically modified crops.

Bayer-Monsanto fusion - a corporate decision with far-reaching consequences - also for human rights

"With this decision the... farmers face even more dependencies, a further restriction of variety selection and diversity,... price dictates, aggravation of the patent situation and monopoly formation in the field... of agriculture. We will not allow multinationals to decide what to put on our fields and plates in the future. " (*ABL - Working Group on Rural Agriculture -Press Release 21. 3. 18*)

A new responsibility of Germany is the Monsanto-Bayer-Fusion. This means that it is directly responsible for the largest corporate player in the field of agrotechnology. The market power of Bayer-Monsanto resulting from fusion worsens the implementation of human rights worldwide even more - the German government must act now:

„ **The committee is urging the government...** to take all necessary measures against extreme poverty among small farmers and to increase **agricultural** production as an important issue... **provide state support so that farmers can buy reproductive seeds that they can reuse** with the aim of eliminating **their dependence on multinationals...**“
(*concludings India 16.05.08*)

"We call on the... Federal Government to set up a state seed fund, that promotes transparent and democratic, ecological and conventional breeding projects that develop seed-solid, reproducible, GMO-free seeds... On the other hand, the promotion of the large seed companies via million-dollar research programs has to be stopped." (*ABL 21.3.18*)

3.) Demands on the German Federal Government - Contributions to the observance of human rights

The Monsanto Tribunal charges the Company for violations of economic, social and cultural human rights worldwide. Here are the **demands of human rights justice**, which are now also directed at the German government as the new headquarter of the Group:

Violations of the right to food under Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

According to the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the right to adequate food is realized when “every man, woman and child, alone or in community with others, has physical and economic access at all times to adequate food or means for its procurement”. **In this context, the Tribunal notes that companies are obliged to respect the right to food in the light of the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the United Nations Guidelines on Business and Human Rights.**

The hearings accounted for negative impacts on production systems and ecosystems, the appearance of invasive species and the loss of efficiency of Roundup over time. Some farmers

were sentenced to pay royalties after their fields were contaminated by genetically modified organisms (GMOs), while others stated that the corporation is taking over the seed market, even though Monsanto's products are not as productive as promised.

In response to Question 2, the Tribunal concludes that Monsanto has engaged in practices that have negatively impacted the right to food. **Monsanto's activities affect food availability for individuals and communities and interfere with the ability of individuals and communities to feed themselves directly or to choose non-genetically modified seeds.**

In addition, genetically modified seeds are not always affordable for farmers and threaten biodiversity. Monsanto's activities and products cause damage to soil, water and to the environment more generally. The Tribunal concludes that food sovereignty is also affected and underlines the cases in which genetic contamination of fields forced farmers to pay royalties to Monsanto or even to abandon their non-GMO crops due to this contamination. There is indeed an infringement on the right to food because of aggressive marketing on GMOs which can force farmers to buy new seeds every year. The dominant agro-industrial model can be criticized even more strongly because other models - such as agroecology exist that respect the right to food.

Violation of the right to the highest attainable standard of health of everyone can reach, as recognized in Article 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

The right to health is intertwined with the rights to food, water and sanitation and to a healthy environment. The right to health is also recognized in many regional human rights protection instruments. In terms of content, it covers both physical and psychological and social aspects of health.

The Tribunal heard witnesses' accounts of severe congenital diseases, development of non-Hodgkin lymphomas, chronic diseases, Lasso poisoning or even death occurring after direct or indirect environmental exposure to products manufactured by Monsanto.

The Tribunal recalls that this company has manufactured and distributed many dangerous substances. First were PCBs, persistent organic pollutants exclusively commercialized by Monsanto between 1935 and 1979 despite the fact that the company knew about their deleterious health impacts. PCBs are now forbidden by the 2001 Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. This carcinogenic product also causes problems with fertility and child development, and disrupts the immune system.

Secondly, glyphosate (ingredient in Roundup) is considered in some studies as a carcinogenic product while other reports, such as the one from the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), conclude the opposite. In an opinion issued on the 15th of March 2017 and related to the classification of glyphosate, the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) indeed estimated that this product could not be classified as a carcinogen, as a mutagen or as toxic for reproduction. The Tribunal however stresses that this classification does not take into account the risks of exposure, with residues found in food, drinking water and even in human urine. The commercialization of Roundup-resistant GMO crop seed has resulted in widespread distribution and use of this product. It is classified as "probably carcinogenic to humans" by the World Health Organisation's (WHO) International Agency for Research on Cancer. Other reports assert the genotoxicity of glyphosate on humans and animals. Last but not least, internal Monsanto documents released in March 2017 as a result of a court order of the U.S. District Court, Northern District of California (San Francisco) show that Monsanto has manipulated science. This makes hollow the so-called scientific controversy about the risks glyphosate pose on health.

Thirdly, the use of GMO seed raises multiple questions. There is a distinct lack of scientific

consensus about the impacts of GMOs on human health. The controversy is embedded in a context of opacity on GMO studies, and even on the **inability of researchers to conduct independent research**. The "Monsanto Papers" cast light on practices of systematic manipulation of scientific studies and on the influence exerted on experts by Monsanto. There is no political consensus on the cultivation of GMOs either. The UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, an independent expert, calls for **the need to follow the precautionary principle at the global level. The Tribunal concludes that Monsanto has engaged in practices that negatively impacted the right to health.**

Violations on the freedom indispensable for scientific research, as guaranteed by Article 15(3) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

The “freedom indispensable for scientific research” closely relates to freedom of thought and expression, as well as the right to information. It is therefore key to safeguarding other fundamental rights, such as the right to health, food, water and a healthy environment. This freedom engenders the requirement to ensure that scientific researchers are able to express themselves freely and are protected when acting as whistle-blowers.

Some of Monsanto's practices mentioned in the testimonies of agronomists and molecular biologists have resulted in court convictions for the company. Among those practices are: illegal GMO plantations; resorting to studies misrepresenting the negative impacts of Roundup by limiting the analysis to glyphosate only while the product is a combination of substances; massive campaigns aiming at discrediting the results of independent scientific studies. These strategies led, for example, to the withdrawal of a study published in an international journal and to the loss of a job for a scientist working in a governmental health agency.

In response to Question 4, **the Tribunal concludes that Monsanto's conduct is negatively affecting the right to freedom indispensable for scientific research**. Conduct such as intimidation, discrediting independent scientific research when it raises serious questions about the protection of the environment and public health, suborning false research reports, putting pressure on governments are transgressing the freedom indispensable for scientific research. **This abuse is exacerbated by exposure to health and accompanying environmental risks, which deprive society the possibility to safeguard fundamental rights**. Taking direct measures to silence scientists or attempting to discredit their work constitutes conduct that abuses the right to freedom indispensable for scientific research and the right to freedom of expression. **This negatively affects the right to information.**

In the third part of the advisory opinion, the Tribunal insists on the widening gap between international human rights law and corporate accountability. It calls for two urgent actions.

First is the need to assert the primacy of international human and environmental rights law. Indeed, a whole set of legal rules are in place to protect investors' rights in the frame of the World Trade Organization, as well as in bilateral investment treaties or in the investment-related clauses of free-trade agreements. These provisions tend to undermine the capacity of nations to maintain policies, laws and practices protecting human and environmental rights.

According to the Tribunal, there is an important risk of a widening gap between international human rights and environmental law and international trade and investment law. **UN bodies urgently need to take action**; otherwise key questions will be resolved by private tribunals operating entirely outside the UN framework.

The second call concerns the need to hold non-state actors responsible within international human rights law. The Tribunal is of the view that **the time is ripe to consider multinational enterprises as subjects of law that could be sued in the case of infringement of fundamental rights.** The Tribunal clearly identifies and denounces a severe disparity between the rights of multinational corporations and their obligations.

Therefore, the advisory opinion encourages authoritative bodies to protect the effectiveness of international human rights and environmental law against the conduct of multinational corporations. (*Summary of the advisory opinion of the International Monsanto Tribunal Delivered on the 18th of April 2017 in The Hague, Netherlands*)

The German government is now largely responsible for this!

Demands of the Pope on governments and corporations to deal with genetic engineering for the observance of economic, social and cultural human rights:

The Pope and our Christian duty - naturally the observance of human rights

"For an economy that doesn't kill. "

"Despite our increases in productivity, billions of people would still be deprived of the simplest economic, social and cultural rights. . . . This system violates Jesus' plan. " (S. 20/21)

"The first task is **to put the economy at the service of the people...** This economy is destroying Mother Earth. (S. 49)

"There is a system with other goals. **A system that introduces methods in industry and agriculture that harm Mother Earth for the sake of "productivity",** and also continues **to deny billions of our brothers and sisters the most elementary economic, social and cultural rights...**(S. 51) ... Both - the new and the old colonialism, which degrades poor countries to mere suppliers of raw materials and cheap labour, generates violence, misery, forced emigration... So we say no to the old and new forms of colonization. . . " (S. 58 / 59.)

"With increasing disappointment we see one international summit following another without any significant outcome. There is a clear, definitive and urgent ethical imperative to act that is not being followed. **We must not allow certain interests - which are global... character - to prevail, subjugate states and international organizations and continue to destroy creation.** The peoples and their movements are called upon... *to demand that appropriate measures be taken immediately...*" (S. 62/63).

"Every campesino has a natural right to own an appropriate piece of land where he can build his home, work for his family's livelihood and have existential security. This right must be guaranteed..." (*Laudato Si* S. 106.) "You should not kill! That is, if twenty percent of the world's population uses resources to such an extent that they rob the poor nations and future generations of what they need to survive." (S. 107)

But he also said "...that this must not give way to indiscriminate genetic manipulation **that denies the negative effects of these interventions.**" (S. 141)

...Although we do not have tangible evidence of the damage that genetically modified cereals can cause to humans... **there are significant difficulties which must not be put into perspective.** In many places, after the introduction of this crop, the fertile soil is concentrated in the hands of a few due to the "gradual disappearance of small producers who were forced to withdraw from direct production as a result of the loss of cultivated land..."

Extending the range of this crop destroys the complex network of ecosystems, reduces production diversity and affects the present and future of each regional economy...

Dependence increases when you think of the production of sterile grain, which ultimately forces farmers to buy grain from the production companies". (S. 144/145).

A government that is ruled by a majority Christian Democratic party must also align its policy with Christian ethical principles!

We urge to the Federal Government :

- To Stop and ban the use of genetic engineering in animal feed, food production and agriculture immediately. This also includes new breeding and the release of genetically modified trees and animals.
- To exert international influence in this sense too - means to vote accordingly in the EU Parliament, etc. , etc.
- An immediate genetically modified soy import ban from abroad and promote feed strategies in Germany to protect our farmers and agriculture
- To introduce the labeling obligation for all genetically modified foodstuffs - including animal feed, animal products and fruit from genetically modified trees - immediately until this general ban becomes effective.
- Putting the new breeding methods under genetic engineering law
- and all genetically modified organisms used in any form in food / feed or released as plants or animals undergo adequate long-term risk tests, which are not carried out by the companies themselves but by strictly supervised independent laboratories and the results of which must be recognized by EFSA.
- Promptly ban glyphosate and other arable poisons so that our soils, bees and the remaining 25% of insects and birds etc. can continue to be fully used and recovered for a healthy and sustainable security of our food sovereignty.
- "...to establish a state seed fund that promotes transparent and democratic, ecological and conventional breeding projects that develop seed-solid, reproducible, GMO-free seeds... The promotion of the large seed companies through -dollar research-programs, on the other hand, must cease. " (ABL 21.3.18)
- To condemn Monsanto-Bayer for the damage caused by Monsanto and established by the Monsanto Tribunal and thus to comply with its international obligations. The Federal Government as the seat of the group has to prevent the further causing of such human rights violations by law. Only in this way it can fulfill its duty to protect its citizens and to secure all our livelihoods in the long term!

We ask the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to express its concern on the increasing market power of agro-technology in Germany and to make recommendations to the Federal Republic on how the resulting violations can be ended.

We urge the Committee to urge the Federal Government to implement its non-compliance with its obligations under the concluding observations to date.

We urge the committee with all its possibilities to set the right course so that a long-term observance of the human right to food sovereignty etc. will still be possible!

Christiane Lüst

Aktion GEN-Klage

Berengariastr. 5, 82131 Gauting, Tel.: 0049 / 89 / 893 11 054

www.stopptgennahrungsmittel.de Mail: christiane.luest@t-online.de