



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.48, No.11

March 23rd, 2012

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: **Anyone for kiwi fruit for breakfast from China?** CNC-world Report from Shaanxi: Kiwi fruit concerns. Zhouzhi county in northwestern Shaanxi Province is well-known for its kiwi fruit. It has the largest kiwi base in China. But, according to a CNC correspondent, it has been discovered that a growth-accelerating chemical is widely used in kiwi planting to increase the yield. In 2010, the output of kiwi fruit in Zhouzhi county reached 250,000 tons.

It seems China brought in the growth accelerator from Japan at the end of 1980s and it was approved for use in 1992. China has no regulations on the use of the growth chemical.

http://www.cncworld.tv/news/v_show/15550_Kiwi_fruits_concern.shtml

GM WHEAT AND CORPORATE CONTROL by **Judy Newman:** The following report is most certainly an issue Queenslanders should be tackling their political 'hopefuls' on. As your representative "what are *they* going to do about it? "

Judy Newman writes: To date, most genetic modification has occurred on crops such as corn, soy, cotton and canola. Products from these genetically modified (GM) crops have largely avoided a GM label because they either go into animal feed, which does not need to be labelled, or they enter the human food supply as highly refined products such as oils, that don't need to be labelled in many countries, including Australia.

Wheat, however, is different. Most wheat goes into the human food supply. And wheat is in a huge proportion of foods that people eat on a daily basis, including bread. Any GM wheat in those products will require a GM label in many countries, including Australia. Which means that consumers will have a choice over whether they want to buy a product with GM wheat in it or an equivalent product that is GM-free. There is overwhelming evidence that given a choice, people prefer not to eat GM foods. Consequently, wheat markets do not want to buy GM wheat,

It is therefore important that if GM wheat is grown commercially anywhere in Australia, it can

- (1) be effectively segregated from non-GM wheat and
- (2) markets will accept that non-GM wheat from Australia is truly non-GM and is not contaminated in any way with GM wheat.

IN THIS ISSUE • *Thought For The Week* • *GM Wheat And Corporate Control* • *In Law, It's The Details That Count* • *The Great Education Debate: A Former Teacher Reflects* • *How Far Should A University Go To Secure Approval And Monetary Reward From Those In Power*

However, it is exceptionally difficult to try to segregate GM wheat to the level expected by the marketplace. It is therefore too expensive to do and still remain competitive. In addition, the wheat industry is expecting that Australian farmers will not try to segregate GM wheat, but rather will mix it with non-GM wheat. Consequently, if GM wheat was commercialised anywhere in Australia, the perception in national and international markets is that our wheat will contain GM wheat unless we can prove, using expensive testing methods, that a particular batch is not. This means that once GM wheat is grown anywhere in Australia, we could instantly lose all of our wheat markets. This was the finding of Canadian farmers. **They asked their markets what would happen if GM wheat was grown commercially in Canada. Their markets said that they would not buy any GM wheat or any supposed non-GM wheat from Canada, they would simply not buy ANY wheat from Canada at all. Consequently, growing GM wheat commercially in Australia could sabotage our entire wheat industry.**

So why then are Australian plant scientists and some of our governments pushing for GM wheat?

Plant breeders usually rely on government or Grains Research and Development Corporation (GRDC) grants to be able to develop new crop varieties. Governments have been reducing the amount of money that goes into crop breeding organisations while GM crop companies have been increasing their share. In addition, if plant breeders do GM crop breeding, they can patent the plants produced, which gives them a cut in the profits and hence some financial security.

The Australian government supports this process, because it can not only reduce the money it spends on crop breeding, but it actually gets to make money via patents on the GM crops that are produced. It does this through the agreements and corporate alliances the public plant breeding sector has signed with GM crop companies.

Farmers are required to pay levies to the GRDC on the grain that they produce. Some of this money is going into GM crop breeding. It would therefore be expected that farmers would hold some of the intellectual property (IP) over these new crops because they have paid for at least some of it. **However, it is not the case. Farmers have no share in the IP on these crops and get no share in the profits. Instead, the IP is traded in deals using confidential agreements between plant breeding organisations such as the CSIRO, and GM companies such as Monsanto.** These types of deals are happening throughout the plant breeding sector, including State-based plant research organisations. As part of a deal, the organisation gets to use Monsanto's patented technologies free of charge to make GM crops more cheaply.

The situation has been particularly obvious in Western Australia (W.A.). There, all public plant breeding institutes merged to form one corporate entity, called Intergrain. Shortly after the commercial planting of GM crops was approved by the WA Minister for Agriculture, Monsanto paid \$10.5 million for a 19.5% share of Intergrain and all the IP developed over decades of plant breeding in that State. Monsanto's alliance partner, Nufarm, now also has the exclusive seed selling rights for crops developed by Intergrain. Intergrain has now taken over the main building of the W.A. Department of Agriculture. (The Department comes under the authority of the Minister for Agriculture.) In return, Monsanto can add their GM genes into all new crop varieties developed in Western Australia. This means that Monsanto will have a patent over all new GM crops developed in the State and will get a cut in the profits made from those crops.

So, what choice does this give farmers in W.A.? Will they still be able to grow crops if they want to? As GM crops make more money for patent-holders than non-GM crops, GM crops will be developed rather than non-GM crops in WA. This means that, in future, farmers will have no choice

but to buy GM seeds and grow GM crops in W.A. because there will be no alternative seeds available to them to buy. When a farmer buys GM seeds to plant, he has to sign a contract with the patent-holder that can dictate how to grow the crop, what herbicides to use, who to deliver the crop to and who to sell it to. **The farmer effectively becomes a contract farmer on his own land where the farmer takes the risks, does the work and pays the bills, while Monsanto owns the crop and controls the upstream and downstream suppliers.** In effect, Monsanto controls the costs to the farmer, the price the farmer gets for the crop and therefore decides how much profit the farmer makes, if any. And the Minister got only \$10.5 million in return.

Elsewhere in Australia, the Grains Research and Development Corporation (GRDC), the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI), and the University of Adelaide (UA) joined together to become Australian Grain Technologies Pty Ltd (AGT). They consolidated more than 100 years of wheat breeding activities when they did so. A wholly owned subsidiary of Limagrain Holdings, a French company, has now purchased 25% of AGT.

Meanwhile, AWB Limited (previously known as the Australian Wheat Board) and Syngenta (a major crop company) have embarked on a formal joint venture. It operates as LongReach Plant Breeders, and it has stated goals of becoming Australia's premier wheat breeding and foundation seed company, and developing wheat for all States of Australia.

There is also international pressure on the Australian government to accept GM crops into the food supply and to grow them in Australia, particularly from the U.S.. The U.S. produces a high proportion of the world's GM crops and needs to find a market for them. Furthermore, some of the largest GM crop companies (e.g., Monsanto) are based in the U.S, so they employ a large number of Americans and they bring their considerable international profits back to the U.S.. In addition, the U.S. government itself has IP and patents on GM crop techniques. Consequently, if GM crops are adopted internationally, it provides financial and food security for the U.S. The U.S. government is therefore putting considerable pressure on Australia and other countries to provide a market for their GM crops and to grow GM crops in their own countries. Because Monsanto is by far the largest GM crop company, this promotes a close relationship between the U.S. government and Monsanto that has resulted in senior staff from Monsanto holding senior positions in the US government. As a result, Monsanto strongly influences U.S. government policies on crops and food.

Meanwhile in Australia, the continuing corporate consolidation of our crop seed production in a few companies, particularly Monsanto, will have a ripple-on effect through the rest of the food chain. Now, every section of the farming industry that uses the seeds, and the food industry that uses the crops produced from those seeds, will need to negotiate prices with these companies, particularly Monsanto. Monsanto not only owns 19.5% of all the plant breeding IP that comes from the largest grain producing state (W.A.), but it also has corporate alliances with almost all of the crop development entities in Australia. It also controls upstream and downstream suppliers to farmers and puts farmers under restrictive GM crop contracts. The result can only be an increase in the cost of food in Australia. (emphasis added throughout ...ed) **Source: "Network of Concerned Farmers" February 2012.**

IN LAW, IT'S THE DETAILS THAT COUNT by Ian Wilson LL.B: Doing law develops an eye for detail. One tends to notice others' paper work mistakes. Thus I note with some amusement that the federal government forgot to arrange for the Governor-General to proclaim a start date for legislation which transferred power from the state courts for heterosexual and homosexual defacto couples' property and maintenance disputes, to the Family Court.

This "unfortunate administration error", as the Attorney General described it (*The Australian*, February 22, 2012, p.1) which is now corrected, still leaves open a challenge to any such orders made by the Family Court in such matters, between March 1, 2009 and February 11, 2012. This could be thousands of cases.

It is a pity that the law industry of the federal government did not spend as much time getting such administrative matters correct as it did pursuing politically correct agendas.

THE GREAT EDUCATION DEBATE: A FORMER TEACHER REFLECTS by James Reed: At one time, long ago, teaching English was my passion. I put a lot of effort into it, sometimes marking essays into the wee hours. But that was long ago. Like a love affair that slowly turns sour, my passion for teaching died – withered and dried on the vine. My new passion in life became alcohol, a dear friend that dulled the pain of what became a boring at best and warzone at worst, work day. The social revolution of the 1960s gave us a world of decadent consumerism, godless materialism and a whole host of poisonous "isms" such as feminism. Thus, once a family could live on a family working-wage provided by dad, the bread-winner. Mum stayed home and thus there was someone there when the kids come home. Nowadays, even conservatives hammer as sexist those who live that world.

Now we have two parents working if we are lucky and a crashing net reproduction ratio: one child if the family is lucky. Mass migration is to keep the capitalists rich as people, like rats, compete for housing space. The world of the past is radically transformed into a vast supermarket and public toilet.

Schools came to be dominated by the ethical system of decadent and diseased capitalism. Old-school discipline is replaced by politically correct brainwashing by monstrous feminist teachers who make Julia Gillard look like a soccer mum. Boys implode in this toxic environment. With runaway ethno-racial diversity, teachers struggle just to keep some degree of order. Schools in Australia become basically childcare centres for techno-savages. Not all, of course. There are enough good schools, even good public schools, to supply the next generation of workers and controllers. But in many schools we find nothing more than "White board jungles" – "black boards" being seen as "racist".

As the Asian societies are not facing this sort of psychopolitical warfare, there is no surprise in finding that the quality of their education is the highest in the world. Our new class elites want our kind to be dispossessed and then die off, as a payback for bringing civilisation to the world.

HOW FAR SHOULD A UNIVERSITY GO TO SECURE APPROVAL AND MONETARY REWARDS FROM THOSE IN POWER? by James Reed: A U.S. university once gave Frank Sinatra an honorary doctorate in engineering. Sinatra, it seems, once wanted to be an engineer. When criticised for this, one defender said that Sinatra could engineer a song!

I thought of that story when reading that Curtin University is under fire for awarding an honorary doctorate to the wife of the Malaysian Prime Minister. ("Razak's Wife in Degree Protest", *The Australian*, February 22, 2012, p.29) The decision has been condemned by many and an online social media campaign to have the university revoke the award is underway. One critic said: "The question is just how far should a university go to secure approval and monetary rewards from those in power."

But why should one university be singled out? Either boycott them all, or live with it. Honorary doctorates have long been used as marketing tools. So why stop there? Why not just sell off degrees and save the time of students from lands afar having to study here at all? Oh, I forgot, that would halt an important part of the immigration program!