

GMO Deregulation: An Act of War

By [Barbara H. Peterson](#)

Global Research, July 19, 2011

farmwars.info 19 July 2011

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Biotechnology and GMO](#)



Scotts Miracle Gro has applied for and received complete deregulation for genetically engineered Kentucky Bluegrass from the USDA. Scotts [“is Monsanto’s exclusive agent for the international marketing and distribution of consumer Roundup®.”](#) The main ingredient in Roundup is glyphosate. This strain of Kentucky Bluegrass will be “herbicide resistant” to Monsanto’s Roundup, and there will be absolutely no oversight of this genetically engineered plant, which can be used as turf or livestock feed. The reason that this was allowed to happen is because actual regulation of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) was designed just for such an opportunity. The program was meant to fail from the very beginning. This is no less than an act of war against the world’s population.



Scotts' genetically engineered (GE) Kentucky Bluegrass will not be regulated as either a plant pest or noxious weed, and these are the ONLY two ways that GMOs can be regulated by the USDA. The genetic engineering process itself is not considered a factor in determining if a plant should fall under regulation by the USDA. If a "plant pest" designated by the USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) is used in the genetic engineering process, then the plant falls under APHIS' regulatory authority. Also, if a plant is considered a noxious weed by APHIS, then its GMO counterpart can be considered a noxious weed. Conversely, if neither condition exists, then the plant falls through the loophole, and is deregulated completely. No oversight whatsoever. APHIS has no grounds on which to enforce regulations.

Plant pest strategy:

APHIS



The situation with the Kentucky bluegrass arises because genetically engineered crops are regulated under rules pertaining to plant pests.

The rules are really meant for pathogens and parasites, not corn stalks. Still, they could be stretched to cover the crops because most of them contain a snippet of DNA from a plant

virus that functions as a genetic on-switch. And the foreign gene is often inserted using a bacterium that can cause a disease in plants.

But in creating its bluegrass, Scotts deliberately avoided using any material from plant pests. The herbicide resistance gene and the genetic on-switch came from other plants and were fired into the grass's DNA with a gene gun, rather than being carried in by a bacterium.

Doug Gurian-Sherman, a senior scientist at the Union of Concerned Scientists, said many of the genetically engineered crops now under development did not use viral material so they could conceivably escape regulation. ([LINK](#))

Noxious Weed strategy:

In a 2002 petition from the ICTA and CFS, the organizations asked if APHIS would regulate GE Kentucky bluegrass under its Federal "noxious weed" authority in the Plant Protection Act. In response to the petition, APHIS conducted a risk assessment to determine the level of weed risk posed by Kentucky bluegrass, and subsequently evaluated whether the impacts posed by the plant would warrant it being regulated as a Federal noxious weed. As a result of its assessment, APHIS determined it would not regulate Kentucky bluegrass, GE or traditional, as a Federal noxious weed. ([LINK](#))

It would seem that the [ICTA and CFS](#) knew of the problem long before deregulation became a reality. So, why didn't we hear about it until it was a done deal?

The GMO regulatory fiction

The fiction of GMO oversight created by the USDA to deceive the public was designed to disintegrate over time so that GMOs could be completely deregulated. It is all one big lie – a facade to enable a complete planetary takeover by mega-corporate interests. If the intent was to actually regulate them, then why not create regulations with teeth? Regulations that would address the unique properties of genetically engineered food/feed instead of using already existing "plant pest" and "noxious weed" regulations? All that needs to be done under the current system is to change the manufacturing process slightly, and GMOs drop right off the USDA radar.

Introduced Substantial Equivalence

The USDA does not recognize the difference between GMOs and traditional plants, based on the "[substantial equivalence](#)" doctrine. Therefore, by removing the offending "plant pest" from the manufacturing process, the regulations no longer apply. And if a traditional version of the plant is not considered a noxious weed, then the GMO version will not be considered a noxious weed. See how easy that was?

It is interesting to note that even though Kentucky Bluegrass rates high on [establishment/spread potential](#), the USDA decided that the [benefits outweigh the risks](#), and since traditional Kentucky Bluegrass is not considered a noxious weed, the GE version cannot be either, because the only difference is herbicide tolerance. The genetic engineering process is not a consideration.

Case precedent has been set by Scotts. All that is left now is for Monsanto and its cohorts in

crime to invest in this new manufacturing technique to bypass any sort of regulation at all for future GMOs. Since Monsanto was already recently given the [green light to do its own Environmental Impact Statements](#) (EIS), it was only a matter of time until complete deregulation was achieved, and Scotts achieved that. So, with no testing required by the USDA, biotech companies such as Monsanto will actually save a bit of time and money in the long run by not even needing to fill out an EIS, or submit any paperwork for approval, because no approval is necessary.

What's the big deal?

If there are no plant pests used in the creation of a GMO, then it should be okay, right? Wrong. The very act of genetic engineering is dangerous and highly unpredictable. According to Arpad Pusztai, world renown scientist and GMO whistleblower,



... the existing data support our suggestion that the consumption by rats of transgenic potatoes expressing GNA has significant effects on organ development, body metabolism and immune function that is fully in line with the significant compositional differences between transgenic and corresponding parent lines of potatoes. The results also suggest that a major part of these differences was not caused by the expression of the GNA gene in the transgenic potato lines but that these could have been due to the presence of one or more of the other gene(s) in the vector used in the gene transfer or to the possibility of disturbances in the functioning of potatoes' own genes caused by the random incorporation of the vector in the potato genome (positioning effect). ([LINK](#))

In other words, whatever you insert in the cell is positioned randomly. This affects the way the cell operates, and no one in the industry has studied this. The cell is essentially wounded, and never heals up the same way twice. Yet, the only testing done is to look at the grown plants to see if they are similar in appearance. Cells are not Legos. You cannot simply remove one block and insert another and have the exact same structure as you had when you started. Something, somewhere is going to be different, and we have no idea how that difference will manifest itself. It is a game of Russian roulette, with people as the unwitting participants.



What this means to you

All new genetically modified crops can now be completely deregulated if one processing ingredient is changed ([APHIS definitions for plant pests](#)), because they will no longer qualify for regulation under the USDA. This means that there will be absolutely no accountability regarding GMOs at all. The labeling movement that has been growing stronger and stronger, will be a moot point because retailers and manufacturers won't even know if what they are selling contains GMOs. No regulations, no oversight. Simply thrown into the market without distinction from traditional items, the only way we will be able to tell if something is genetically engineered is if.... well, we won't. Period. As an official at the USDA told me: "I don't know why GE Kentucky Bluegrass would be regulated, almost all plants are genetically engineered." That is the USDA's attitude.

Enter the Terminator

It seems that the plan all along was to deregulate GMOs completely, but the charade had to be maintained until a prestigious time to avoid public backlash too soon, such as what happened with the [Terminator](#) seed [moratorium](#). Public outcry caused this technology to be put on hold, but testing continues to this day. Watch and wait for the Terminator to be released without any regulation or oversight, due to this new deregulation salvo launched on the American public. The stage is set. First take over all plant life with genetically

modified plants, then introduce the Terminator to wrap it all up in a pretty package.



But the Terminator has sterile seeds and cannot reproduce you say? Wouldn't this be a solution to GM contamination? Well, one of the problems with Terminator technology is that it cannot be proven to be 100% reliable, and it is possible that not all seeds will be sterile, and the Terminator gene could be spread to viable plants, thus infecting the entire food chain with plants unable to produce offspring. Not to mention [horizontal gene transfer](#). The norm would become plant sterility, with viable seeds becoming rare. The only way to get viable seeds would be to buy them. No more saving seeds, because the seed you save

would be sterile.

If all plant life is owned by mega-corporations due to total contamination by invasive GMOs, and no regulations are in effect that apply to them, then Terminator technology can be instituted at will with no roadblocks. After all, if you own all of the plants, then you can do with them as you like. This may well be part of a well planned strategy for the complete takeover of every living plant on earth by corporate interests. Man the torpedoes, full speed ahead. Maybe we can now get a glimpse of just why the Svalbard Global Seed Vault might have been built, and why it contains only viable, foundation seeds – no GMOs.

Conclusion

The regulations for GMOs contain no teeth and are just there for show – to fool the public into thinking there is real oversight when in actuality, there isn't. The USDA is a rogue agency of the Federal government that has proven time and time again that its only purpose is to provide a distraction for the American public so that corporate interests are able to completely take over our food supply with little to no interference from the people they are injuring.

This Kentucky Bluegrass case precedent has the potential to be the single biggest food event on the planet. The complete deregulation of all GMOs means that anything goes. As long as there are no plant pests involved in the genetic engineering process that are listed on the [APHIS](#) site, then it is possible that just about anything else can be inserted into the plants, including pharmaceuticals, vaccines, psychotropic substances, etc., without our knowledge or consent. Pandora's box has just been opened, and closing it is quickly becoming 'not an option.'

The original source of this article is farmwars.info
Copyright © [Barbara H. Peterson](#), farmwars.info, 2011

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Barbara H. Peterson](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca