Food Fights Labeling and Othe Engineered Foods



Peggy G. Lemaux University of California, Berkeley http://ucbiotech.org http://pmb.berkeley.edu/profile/plemaux#a1

What will be covered?

1. Background on genes, genetics, genetic engineering

2. What GE crops are commercialized? In the pipeline?

3. What is the regulatory situation for GE crops and foods?

4. What are some of the issues with GE crops and foods?

Animals and plants are made of cells – humans too – billions of them!

uchiotech o

Inside each of those cells is the genetic information, its DNA, that determines its host's characteristics

Dividing cell

Genes are the individual recipes in the DNA that specify characteristics. Now we can find where those recipes are on the DNA

How are the genes and chromosomes manipulated to create a new plant variety... by classical breeding?

Triticum monococcumTriticum aestivumAncient varietyModern bread variety

Information in the wheat genome

Chemical units represented by alphabetic letters

1700 books 1000 pages each

1700 books (or 1.7 million pages)

Hybridization or cross breeding of wheat

1700 books (or 1.7 million pages) 1700 books (or 1.7 million pages) 1700 books (or 1.7 million pages)

But there are other ways to create new varieties using the modern tools of genetics

Table of contents for wheat genes

(or 1.7 million pages)

Marker-assisted selection used to protect rice against bacterial blight and blast disease

Limited to diversity in compatible relatives

How can limitations be overcome?

Genetic Engineering Methods

Classical	npared to <i>Genetic</i>
Breeding con	<i>Engineering</i>
Uses plant machinery in plant	Uses plant machinery in laboratory
Gene exchange is random	Gene exchange is specific
involving whole genome	involving single or few genes
Source of gene primarily within genera – not between kingdoms like plants & bacteria	Source of gene from any organism

USDA ERS

Number of different traits available in GE crops is limited

Bt Crops – insect resistance using gene from naturally occurring bacterium Herbicide-tolerant tolerate herbicide application

Despite limited crop and trait types, worldwide acreage is increasing

Total worldwide area cultivated = Areas of Texas + California + Colorado + Louisiana

Although there are few GE whole foods, use of ingredients from corn, soybean, canola, sugarbeet leads to estimates that 75% of U.S. processed foods have GE ingredients

Field Trials in California with Grape Root Stocks Engineered to Resist Fanleaf Virus

SOURCE: http://www.democratandchronicle.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080806/BUSINESS/808060336/1001

SOURCE: http://archives.foodsafety.ksu.edu/agnet/2007/4-2007/agnet_april_10.htm#story0

Potato engineered to reduce levels of acrylamide, a potential carcinogen and known neurotoxin

SOURCE: Wu, L., Bhaskar, P.B., Busse, J.S., Zhang, R., Bethke, P.C. and and Jiang, J. 2011. Developing Cold-Chipping Potato Varieties by Silencing the Vacuolar Invertase Gene. Crop Science 51: 981-990.

Mitigating food allergies, like peanut, soy and wheat

Engineered Safflower Oil Enhanced with Omega-3 and Omega-6 Fatty Acids

What is the U.S. regulatory process governing engineered plants and foods?

- Field testing

 Permits
 Notifications
- Determination of non-regulated status

- Food safety
- Feed safety

Pesticidal plants

 tolerance
 exemption
 registrations

cbiotech.ors

 \geq

 Herbicide registration

Plant pest?

Danger to people?

Risk to environment?

What Are Some Issues with GE Crops?

What are some of the food safety issues?

- Changes in nutritional content
- No peer-reviewed food safety tests
- Creation of allergens or activation of toxins
- Labeling
- Pharma crops contaminating food supply
- Gene flow from food to intestinal bacteria increasing antibiotic resistance

What are some environmental issues?

- Gene flow to generate
 "superweeds" (herbicide tolerance to wild/ weedy species)
- Transfer of transgenes to organic crops?
- Spread of pharmaceutical genes into commercial crops?
- Loss of genetic diversity?
- Property rights (gene patents)?

What are some of the food safety issues?

- Changes in nutritional content
- No peer-reviewed food safety tests
- Creation of allergens or activation of toxins
- Labeling
- Pharma crops contaminating food supply
- Gene flow from food to intestinal bacteria increasing antibiotic resistance

Safety of food is based on principle of Substantial Equivalence. Is it as safe as the conventional food?

Substantial Equivalence

Modified food has essentially all characteristics of nonmodified food with respect to food and feed value

SOURCE: Safety of Genetically Engineered Foods: Aproaches to Assessing Unintended Health Effects 2004. Natl Acad Press

Substantial Equivalence: Amino Acids

These results have been generated on event GA21. Data showing similar amino acid composition have been generated on the other corn events.

Crops can be engineered with purposeful nutritional alterations

Engineering tomato to increase healthpromoting compounds

Golden Rice engineered to contain bioavailable pro-Vitamin A

Normal portion of Golden Rice 2 provides half of a child's Vitamin A needs

What are some food safety issues?

- Changes in nutritional content
- Lack of peer-reviewed food safety tests
- Creation of allergens or activation of toxins
- Labeling
- Pharma crops contaminating food supply
- Gene flow from food to intestinal bacteria increasing antibiotic resistance

Poultry and Egg Study: Bt Protein Analysis

Example of type of animal safety tests conducted

- 14 day poultry feeding study
- Diet: contained 64% grain (Bt or non Bt)
- Eggs collected on days 13 & 14
- Muscle and liver samples collected on day 14

Tissue	Bt Protein Analysis	
- white muscle (10)	Not detected	
 dark muscle (10) 	Not detected	
- liver (10)	Not detected	
 egg whites (10) 	Not detected	
 egg yolk (10) 	Not detected	

REVIEW STUDY FROM FRANCE

12 long-term (>90d to 2yr) and 12 multigenerational (2 to 5 generations) feeding trials in animals of GE feed <u>Conclusion</u>: GE foods are nutritionally equivalent to non GE foods and can be safely consumed in food and feed

SOURCE: Snell C, Bernheim A, Berge J-P, Kuntz M, Pascal G, Paris A, Ricroch AE. 2012. Assessment of the health impact of GM plant diets in long-term and multigenerational animal feeding trials: A literature review. Food and Chemical Toxicology 50: 1134-1148.

What are some food safety issues?

- Changes in nutritional content
- Lack of peer-reviewed food safety tests
- Creation of allergens or activation of toxins
- Labeling
- Pharma crops contaminating food supply
- Gene flow from food to intestinal bacteria increasing antibiotic resistance

Why Doesn't FDA Have a Labeling Policy for GE Foods?

Actually it does...

GE foods are subject to same labeling laws as all other foods and food ingredients

This label information relates to composition not agricultural or manufacturing practices

No label needed if food is essentially equivalent in safety, composition and nutrition

GE food must be labeled if it has:

1. Different nutritional characteristics

2. Genetic material from known allergenic source e.g., peanut, egg

3. Elevated levels of antinutritional or toxic cmpounds

Also, for whole fresh foods, there are existing PLU labels that indicate whether they are GE or organic

ACT #imPACTfact @wearPACT SOURCE: WWW.PLUCODES.COM

National GM Labeling Laws and Policies

		Countries with	Countries with
	Countries	partially enforced	probable plans
Type of	that enforce	or unenforced	to introduce a
GM labeling	labeling policies	labeling policies	labeling policy

Mandatory

Australia, Brazil, <u>China, European</u> <u>Union, Japan, New</u> Zealand, Norway, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, Switzerland, Taiwan Croatia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Ukraine, Vietnam Nigeria, Uganda, UAE, Zambia

But other nations have specific mandatory labeling laws for GE, although the rules and enforcement vary dramatically among countries, making international trade difficult

SOURCE: Marchant, G.E., Cardineau, G.A. and Redick, T.P. 2010. Thwarting Consumer Choice: The Case against Mandatory Labeling for Genetically Modified Foods. American Entreprise Institute, p. 71.

Voluntary

Argentina, <u>Canada</u>, Chile, Hong Kong, Kenya, Philippines, South Africa, <u>USA</u> Peru

Do U.K. consumers act on labeling information?

66% of UK consumers think GE food labeling is important...

But only 2% actively look for GE content when buying foods

SOURCE: "FSA survey: Majority of UK consumers back GM labelling", Food Navigator, January 10, 2013. http://www.foodnavigator.com/content/view/print/728839 Link to report: http://www.food.gov.uk/science/research/ssres/foodsafetyss/gm-labelling/#.UPXkHaHr7jm

In November 2012 California voted on Proposition 37 to require mandatory labeling of foods with GE ingredients.

What did that Proposition look like?

CA Labeling Proposition

Labeling Relating to Genetic Engineering

- Any retail product that has been <u>or may have</u> been partially or wholly produced with genetic engineering must be labeled.
- Any raw retail agricultural commodity must contain on the front of its package in <u>clear and conspicuous</u> words, "Genetically Engineered".
- Any processed foods, <u>unless exempted</u>, must have conspicuous language on package stating, "Partially Produced with Genetic Engineering" or "<u>May be</u> Partially Produced with Genetic Engineering".
 Numerous exemptions for organic, animals fed GE or injected with GE, foods with GE processing aids, alcohol, foods for immediate consumption, medical foods

 Labeling Relating to Using "Natural"
 Foods meeting GE definitions, or processed, may not be labeled as "natural", "naturally made", "naturally grown", "all natural".

ucbiotech.org

California voters nix biotech labels

Opponents raised \$46 million to fight proposition

By ALICIA CHANG Associated Press

LOS ANGELES — Voters spurned a ballot measure that would have made California the first in the nation to affix labels on breakfast cereals, baked goods and other processed foods containing genetically modified ingredients.

The rejection on Nov. 6 followed an expensive offensive from agri-business and chemical conglomerates, which raised \$46 million to blitz airwaves and mailboxes with negative advertising.

We didn't think they'd like the lawsuits, more bureaucracy, higher costs and loopholes and exemptions. It looks like they don't," spokeswoman Kathy Fairbanks said.

Representatives with the California Right to Know campaign tried to put on a positive face.

"No matter what happens, we've raised awareness of a very important issue," said Grant Lundberg, chief executive of Lundberg Family Fams, who co-chairs the California Right to Know campaign.

e Consumer activists and the organic food industry said shoppers crave information about what they're cating and should be given all the information they need to decide for them-

After over \$40M was spent convincing voters one way or the other, the proposition was defeated 51.4% to 48.6%

the more voters learned about Prop 37, the less they'd like it.

significantly different in taste, k texture and nutrition.

kered with in the laboratory to resist pesticides and ward off th

tory to Despite scientific consensus ard off that genetically modified foods

ry labeling exists elsewhere, including the European Union.

SOURCE: "California voters rebuff labels on GMO foods", Capital Press, November 8, 2012 http://www.capitalpress.com/print/AP-CA-Prop-37-Food-labeling-110712

Organic Bytes

Health, Justice and Sustainability News from the Organic Consumers Association

A weakly a newslatter adited by Katherine Paul and Repaie Cummins

ESSAY OF THE WE End of Story? GMO Food Fight: Round Two 2013

"This gives us hope that you can, with a wellfunded, well-organized, well-executed campaign, defeat a ballot initiative and go directly to the voters. We hope we don't have too many of them, because you can't keep doing that over and over again . . . ".

- Jennifer Hatcher, Food Marketing Institute, on Big Food and Big Biotech's narrow defeat of Prop 37, the California Right to Know GMO ballot initiative.

Not in California, nor a number of other states

Feb 1, 2013, 12:50pm MST

GMO food-labeling bill voted down

- In some states, like NM, bills were voted down.
 - In other states, decisions are pending.
- In WA, voters will cast their ballots Nov. 5 on GE labeling bill.
- In CT, labeling bill requires 4 other border states to pass laws before labels are required.
- In ME, labeling law requires 5 other states to pass laws before labeling is required.

Ehe New York Eimes

March 8, 2013

Major Grocer to Label Foods With Gene-Modified Content

By STEPHANIE STROM

Whole Foods Market, the grocery chain, on Friday became the first retailer in the United States to require labeling of all genetically modified foods sold in its stores, a move that some experts said could radically alter the food industry.

Not only are states entering into the labeling arena, but a variety of companies are becoming involved in different ways.

SOURCE: "Major Grocer to Label Fodos With Gene-Modified Content", New York Times, 3/8/13 http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/09/business/grocery-chain-to-require-labels-for-genetically-modified-food.html?ref=opinion&_r=0

By 2018, all products in U.S. and Canadian stores must be labeled to indicate whether they contain genetically modified organisms (GMOs)

'We intend to label our Arctic apples as genetically modified'

Okanagen Specialty Fruits has decided to

voluntarily label their GE apples.

APPLE from Page 1

prohibition that barred the state Legislature from modifying it unless it was made more stringent. Opponents, including Monsanto, DuPont, food companies and grocery stores, spent \$45 million against the proposition.

Carter believes he is about six months away from gaining USDA and U.S. Food and Drug Administration approval to grow and sell genetically modified apples in the United States. He is also seeking Canadian government approval.

His Arctic brand Golden Delicious and Arctic Granny Smith apples have been modified by switching off a gene, so they won't brown when sliced. That could benefit the sliced

Dan Wheat/Capital Press Joel Brooks, marketing communications specialist for Okanagan Specialty Fruits, of Summerland, British Columbia, talks to people about ing because it undermines the credibility of the FDA, which does its review. It has standards for food safety. This is mandating labeling of something that has no risk. I don't agree with that. It becomes too much negative marketing."

The battle isn't as much about food safety as it is about market share between the organic and natural food side versus big, biotech corporations, Carter said.

"We're a small company," he said. "We can't engage in that."

The recession shrank the organic industry, which "wants to use labeling to scare people into buying organic," he said. That's the wrong motivation, he said, and it should be about food safety.

around for 15 years, fed 4 trillion people and never been a single health risk, yet nine people died from organic bean sprouts in Germany last year," he said. "Organics can kill people with E.coli."

But the Pacific Northwest apple industry, fearing negative public reaction, is on the record against USDA approval of genetically engineered apples.

The Northwest Horticultural Council in Yakima, Wash., representing tree fruit growers and packers in Washington, Oregon and Idaho, sent USDA Secretary Tom Vilsack a letter in 2011 asking him to reject Carter's application for nonregulated status of his two gcnetically engineered apples.

"While we do not think any

cil president wrote in the letter.

Todd Fryhover, president of the Washington Apple Commission, has said genetic modification raises public concerns and doesn't seem to fit with the image of apples as healthy and nutritious.

Carter and other representatives of Okanagan Specialty Fruits early this month, for the first time, had booths to display and talk about Arctic apples at the annual meetings of the Washington State Horticultural Association and the Great Lakes Fruit, Vegetable and Farm Market Expo in Michigan.

It was an educational outreach with lots of grower questions answered, he said.

Contacts were made for potentially more grower testing,

he said.

ower in Washinged about 10 acres nd quality, Carter nting should proit in 2014, v^{ucbiotech.org} apples shou

SOURCE: "Biotech apples inflame debate", Capital Press, December 20, 2012 http://www.capitalpress.com/orewash/djw-GMOapples-w-art-121912

apple by expens ments r brownir apples i services all apple "As

THE Huffington Post

GMO Labeling Bill Voted Down In Senate

Posted: 05/23/2013 11:31 am EDT | Updated: 05/23/2013 4:08 pm EDT

WASHINGTON -- The United States Senate decided again Thursday that it simply does not want to let states tell people whether or not they are

And now the labeling issue has moved to the national stage...via numerous proposed bills and amendments

on the issue.

But Sen. Debbie Stabenow (D-Mich.), the chair of the Agriculture Committee, argued that the measure "is not germane to the farm bill" in the first place. She also said the labels run counter to science and the public interest in healthy food.

If a decision at the national level is not made – in some way or another – there will be a potpourri of state labeling bills that will make interstate commerce very problematic- similar to existing issues with international trade.

SOURCE: "GMO Labeling Bill Voted Down In Senate", Huffington Post, 5/22/13 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/23/gmo-labeling-bill-genetically-modifiedfood_n_3325972.html

for consumers,

p diseases and being done by

ough it was not

Consider that 75% of U.S. processed foods have GE ingredients. If mandatory labeling laws were enacted, either manufacturers would have to find alternatives to the GE ingredients – which might be difficult – or the vast majority of processed foods would be labeled that they "contain" or "may contain genetically engineered ingredients"

While the fresh food aisle would change little, the majority of foods in the processed food aisle would contain "warning labels" about GE ingredients.

Consider the following...

Governor Vows to End Prop. 65 'Shake-down' Suits

by Amy Standen | May 8, 2013 — 8:47 AM

- 1986: CA passed Prop. 65 to protect citizens from toxic substances, requiring "warning labels" where toxic substances are present.
- Prop 65 warning labels are so prevalent they have become meaningless.

- Could "warning labels" on GE foods also become meaningless due to their prevalence?
- Such labeling also resulted in frivolous law suits: banks were sued for not having Prop. 65 warnings on ATM's since nearby smokers might expose ATM users to toxic substances.

Might there be another possible market-driven solution?

GNI FREE If there is demand, might another solution be to allow the creation of a specialty market for labeled GEfree foods – for which people pay a premium price and for which farmers are paid premium prices to grow them?

And other consumers have the choice to buy unlabeled GE foods without a premium price?

Where to get more information on GE issues including labeling?

http://ucbiotech.org

SCIENCE-BASED INFORMATION & RESOURCES ON AGRICULTURE, FOOD & TECHNOLOGY

ABOUT US NEWS ISSUES & RESPONSES GMO LABELING RESOURCES LINKS GLOSSARY

Select Language

SEARCH

This website provides educational resources focused broadly on issues related to agriculture, crops, animals, foods and the technologies used to improve them. Science-based information related to these issues is available, as well as educational tools and information, which can be used to promote informed participation in discussions about these topics.

FEATURED LECTURE

"Feast, Famine and the Future of Food"

Outreach in Biotechnology and for Thought Lecture Series Oregon State University January 25, 2012

BIOTECHNOLOGY

Labeling: Informational resources available.

Review articles: Focused on food, environmental and socioeconomic issues of GE crops and foods. Part 1 Part 2

Part 1 | Part 2

RESOURCES FOR OUTREACH & EXTENSION, RESEARCHERS & TEACHERS

DNA for Dinner 4-H curriculum: For grades 5-8, covers topics from plant diversity to genetic engineering. Each of the five lessons has 3 to 5 activities.

New Game: Who's In Your Family? A free educational game to teach participants about the diversity of f

participants about the diversity of fruits and vegetables, and how they are related.

<u>Slide Archive:</u> Extensive collection of PP slides on agriculture & biotechnology.

Available on loan:

Teaching Aids: Handouts and cards available, in both English and Spanish.

Educational displays: "Genetics and Foods" and "Genetic Diversity and Genomics" available with companion educational cards and teacher worksheet in English and Spanish.

Gene-IE Juice Bar: Interactive activity to isolate DNA from common fruits and vegetables.

Academics Review Academics Review website Testing popular claims against peer-reviewed science.

Provides factual information to

foster discussion about agriculture, especially plant genetics and genetic engineering.

Provides education on use of animal genomics & biotechnology in livestock production.

