Feature

Integrated farming:
Why organic farmers should use transgenic crops

Klaus Ammann,

written at Delft University, Netherlands

klaus.ammann@ips.unibe.ch

Version with full text links, based on the printed publication in New Biotechnology

Ammann Klaus. (2008). Feature: Integrated farming: Why organic farmers should use transgenic crops, open source citations. *New Biotechnology, 25*(2), pp. 101 - 107. http://www.ask-force.org/web/NewBiotech/Ammann-Integrated-Farming-Organic-Farmers-use-transgenic-Crops-print-2008.pdf

Abstract

The concept of organic farming is summarized and compared to farming with biotechnology derived crops. If done with an ecological concept, both methods can be seen as ecologically acceptable. Organic farming does not offer consistent arguments for the rejection of transgenic crops. Some arguments (from genomics to biodiversity) are discussed in order to demonstrate that the contrast between both farming systems is rated too high and that it is possible to overcome the divide. In this way the floor is prepared for a proposal how to merge those otherwise incompatible agricultural management systems, a proposal which also will have to build on a new concept of sustainability. It will be dealt with in a second half of the publication in the next issue of New Biotechnology.

1. Introductory remarks

It is important to distinguish properly between different kinds of organic farming. This text is not about small holders forced into 'organic farming' due to lack of resources and in particular lack of fertilizer, or worse, encouraged through misguided foreign aid programmes which can only be maintained through external subsidies. Romantic views about traditional subsistence farming are not very convincing, since farmers also have a right to enjoy the virtues of a good life due to modern technology and proper mechanization. Two accounts (Trewavas, 2001, 2004) provide ample insight into the negative factors of organic and integrated farming management systems *per se* and how by following strict rules, often not based on science, organic farming systems can lead to wrong decisions in management and production. Still, it cannot be denied, that there are numerous scientific accounts which demonstrate also positive sides of organic farming, as conceded even in otherwise critical reviews (Avery, 2006; Taverne, 2007), see also below.

On the other hand, biotech crops are often connoted in an unjustified negative way, there is recently an unfortunate tendency of high level reports which are, due to an awkward production system seriously biased with a 'democratic' participation of hundreds of authors and no real independent peer review, this in contrast to the case of the UN global warming reports.

This is why e.g. the IAASTD report 'International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development' http://www.agassessment.org/ is not meeting proper scientific standards and therefore comes to questionable negative conclusions about biotechnology in agriculture, (Kiers et al., 2008; Murphy, 2008; Stokstad, 2008; Van Montagu, 2008):

Here just one of the IAASTD's unacceptable conclusions, ignoring a plethora of science based biosafety literature:

"Change is rapid, the domains involved are numerous, and there is a significant lack of transparent communication among actors. Hence assessment of modern biotechnology is lagging behind development; information can be anecdotal and contradictory, and uncertainty on benefits and harms is un-avoidable."

The approach here is strictly based on scientific views as published in peer reviewed journals and tries to give a balanced judgement, addressing also the benefits of various agricultural management systems. It is also based on a more extensive contribution given in the 'IP Handbook of Intellectual Property Management in Health and Agricultural Innovation' by the author (Ammann, 2007) and learning from an extensive literature research.

In order to make some viewpoints clear, the contrast is built between organic and biotech-supported farming, knowing very well that the intermediate zone would offer lots of positive thought and synergies. Indeed, the conclusion from this text could well be something like a new concept of integrated farming, taking into account the best from even the most diverse and seemingly incompatible farming systems. This synthetic part will be dealt with in a second article in the following volume of New Biotechnology.

2. The concept of organic farming

Organic agriculture is developing rapidly, and statistical information is now available from 138 countries of the world. Its share of agricultural land and farms continues to grow in many countries. According to the latest survey on organic farming worldwide, (Willer Helga et al., 2008) almost 30.4 million hectares are managed organically by more than 700'000 farms (2006), this constitutes 0.65 percent of the agricultural land of the countries covered by the survey . It should not be overlooked that, with recently increasing food prices also in the developed world, organic farming could meet some economic limits (Koning et al., 2008; Smith & Marsden, 2004).

Organic farming has started as a heterogeneous management method in agriculture due to its multiple origins. Certification of organic farming practices with follow-up inspection has been introduced in various decades and many different places. Organic farming and a multitude of various similar labels are now growing rapidly out of the corner of backward thinking luddites (although admittedly they are still there), becoming a veritable industry. Regulation has been imposed more or less strictly on all organic farms of regions like California (Guthman Julie, 1998, 2004) and the European Union (Brouwer Floor & Lowe Philiip, 2000; Häring et al., 2004; Lampkin et al., 1999). The International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM) is now uniting the organic movements of the world with 750 members in 108 states, supported also by the United Nations FAO, www.ifoam.org. The website offers a lot of information, for instance some basic views on organic farming, such as the following four principles:

- *Principle of health*
  Organic Agriculture should sustain and enhance the health of soil, plant, animal, human and planet as one and indivisible.
- *Principle of ecology*
  Organic Agriculture should be based on living ecological systems and cycles, work with them, emulate them and help sustain them.
- *Principle of fairness*
  Organic Agriculture should build on relationships that ensure fairness with regard to the common environment and life opportunities
- *Principle of care*
  Organic Agriculture should be managed in a precautionary and responsible manner to protect the health and well-being of current and future generations and the environment.

The specific agricultural rules are still debated in order to find the right mix between regulatory strictness and allowing for a maximum diversity of the rules according to region and crop, some important documents like the draft principles exceed on purpose the basic principles of organic farming: (IFOAM, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2007) in order to stimulate discussion and show targets and tendencies proposed. It can be said without hesitation, that the above general rules can also be applied to most agricultural management systems of today.

Since 2005 (IFOAM, 2005) there is an official definition document existing on organic agriculture (the process is still going on and transparently elaborated at several positions of the IFOAM and other websites). Here a recent text example included into the document, without approving it definitely:

“Organic agriculture, as defined by IFOAM, includes all agricultural systems that promote environmentally, socially and economically sound production of food and fibers. Recycling nutrients and strengthening natural processes helps to maintain soil fertility and ensure successful production. By respecting the natural capacity of plants, animals and the landscape, it aims to optimize quality in all aspects of agriculture and the environment. Organic Agriculture dramatically reduces external inputs by refraining from the use of synthetic fertilizers and pesticides, Genetically Modified Organisms and pharmaceuticals. Pests and diseases are controlled with naturally occurring means and substances according to both traditional as well as modern scientific knowledge, increasing both agricultural yields and disease resistance. Organic agriculture adheres to globally accepted principles, which are implemented within local socio-economic, climatic and cultural settings. As a logical consequence, IFOAM stresses and supports the development of self-supporting systems on local and regional levels”.

This is a remarkable statement stressing exclusively the rural situation – but what about the rapidly growing urban and semi-urban areas? Also the statement ‘increasing both agricultural yields and resistance’ seem, in the light of a majority of scientific data, somehow too optimistic. It is unacceptable to base on manipulated statistics some euphemistic statements such as: “Organic farming can feed the world” (Badgley et al., 2007), which is convincingly contradicted (Avery, 2007), criticizing the statistical analysis of this paper.

3. Ecological aspects of organic farming

Altieri & Nicholls (Altieri & Nicholls, 2003) summarize their views of agro ecology, see also in: http://www.cnr.berkeley.edu/~agroeco3/principles_and_strategies.html

- Enhance recycling of biomass and optimizing nutrient availability and balancing nutrient flow.
- Securing favorable soil conditions for plant growth, particularly by managing organic matter and enhancing soil biotic activity.
- Minimizing losses due to flows of solar radiation, air and water by way of microclimate management, water harvesting and soil management through increased soil cover.
- Species and genetic diversification of the agro ecosystem in time and space.
- Enhance beneficial biological interactions and synergisms among agro biodiversity components thus resulting in the promotion of key ecological processes and services.

Altieri and colleagues do not exclude explicitly transgenic plants, but criticize heavily multinational seed companies, which is not justified for the following two reasons:

- Surprisingly, in developing countries there are only minimal conflicts between multinational seed companies and subsistence farming, if one follows official statistics published by Cohen (Cohen, 2005) and the FAO (Dhlamini et al., 2005). The great majority of projects involving modern seed varieties in the developing world are controlled and developed by public research and local biotech companies.

- There is a growing tendency that modern seed varieties developed by multinational breeding companies are used in important projects for the introduction of transgenic varieties in developing countries, but it is already routine that, confirmed by contracts, the useful germplasm is donated free of royalties: good examples are given by the biofortification programs for the Golden Rice (Mayer et al., 2008), the Harvest Plus program (Graham et al., 2007) and the SuperSorghum Africa Harvest program http://www.ahbfi.org/ .

Elaborate factorial networks have been established on the principles of organic farming related to soil, an instructive summary scheme of the complex interrelationships in an agro-system is given by Watson (Watson et al., 2002) fig.1, there is no reason why a system like this cannot be adopted by conventional farming including transgenic crops.

Much has been written on the *biodiversity aspects* of organic farming. First we should ask about *what* biodiversity we want to enhance and maintain in our agricultural systems. It is a romantic misunderstanding that within the crop fields we should tolerate weeds and even call them euphemistically “Beikräuter” and not “Unkräuter” as Germans sometimes define them. Weeds mixed within yield often spoil the harvest considerably (Firbank, 1988) . Misconcepts like these are often suggested by ecologists who have only little knowledge about agriculture and who have always worked in natural or nature-like ecosystems (Ammann K. in: et al., 2004). Rather we should seek for the benefits of a more balanced agro-environment with a higher biodiversity *outside* the production fields (Clemetsen & van Laar, 2000; Dollaker, 2006; Dollaker & Rhodes, 2007; Grashof-Bokdam & van Langevelde, 2005; IFOAM, 2004b; Stehlik et al., 2007; Volker, 1992). The misunderstandings about ecological agriculture go even deeper than just mentioned above for some other reasons: It is a widespread misconcept to believe, that ancestral farmers worked with crop fields with a high biodiversity, tolerating nolens volens a lot of weeds. As Wood and Lenne (Wood & Lenne, 2001) have shown in 'Nature's Fields', our main crops like rice, wheat, barley, sorghum etc. lived in natural monocultures and this was the reason for choice of those crops. The same misconcept is perpetuated in the British Farm-scale Experiments, which aim at a high biodiversity per se by a comparison of transgenic with non-transgenic crops revealing that transgenic maize and beet show better biodiversity data, not so oilseed rape (May et al., 2005; Perry et al., 2004; Perry et al., 2003).

We should aim at a more realistic idea of biodiversity in agriculture, which works with a landscape concept, in addition we should not generalize prematurely. We will have to seriously differentiate according to crop and region (Kleijn et al., 2006).

A meta study (Bengtsson et al., 2005) comes to the same conclusions, verifying also that the introduction of holistic-organic agricultural activities introduced in landscapes with predominantly intensive and industrial agriculture have a much higher positive effect, less so in small-scale landscapes comprising many other biotopes as well as agricultural fields.

According to another extensive review (Hole et al., 2005) three broad management practices are highlighted:

- Prohibition/reduced use of chemical pesticides and inorganic fertilizers
- Sympathetic management of non-cropped habitats
- And preservation of mixed farming) that are largely intrinsic (but not exclusive) to organic farming, and that are particularly beneficial for farmland wildlife.

However, the review also draws attention to the following issues:

- It remains unclear whether a 'holistic' whole-farm approach (i.e. organic) provides greater benefits to biodiversity than carefully targeted prescriptions applied to relatively small areas of cropped and/or non-cropped habitats within conventional agriculture (i.e. agro-environment schemes) such as proposed by Dollacker (Dollaker, 2006, 2007)
- Many comparative studies encounter methodological problems, limiting their ability to draw quantitative conclusions, therefore our knowledge on the impacts of organic farming is limited and there is a pressing need for longitudinal, system-level studies.

In a 21 years monitoring experiment organic farming methods the results demonstrated clearly positive effects on biodiversity and soil fertility in Switzerland (Fliessbach et al., 2000; Mader et al., 2002b), however the experiment also revealed clearly lower yields for the organic methods monitored (Goklany et al., 2002; Mader et al., 2002a)

4. A critique of arguments, why organic farming rejects transgenesis and closely related breeding methods

While the concept of organic farming contains good elements, it is often also distorted by ideological bias, foremost the one against modern breeding methods. Biodynamic agriculture, based on the ideas of Rudolf Steiner (Steiner, 1958), is an mix of interesting spiritual thought and traditional down to earth knowledge, again needing to be carefully scrutinized and to sort the wheat from the chaff. Here I concentrate on some of the mainstream arguments – why e.g. organic farmers nearly all reject modern plant breeding with transgenesis and many rules also reject mutational breeding and even distant hybridization.

Lammerts-Van Buhren et al. (Van Bueren, E. T. L. et al., 2003) try to explain on the molecular level, why organic farming cannot accept genetic engineering with a number of arguments. Following Verhoog (Verhoog et al., 2003), they state that the *concept of naturalness* of organic agriculture not only leads to the avoidance of inorganic, chemical inputs and to the application of other agro-ecological principles, but also implies integrity of the crops as a whole. This concept also embraces their definition of the *intrinsic integrity of plant* genomes taking into account a *bio-centric perspective* (both terms lack a proper definition, more comments are given in (Ammann, 2007).

From the above provided definition of the nature of plants and their qualities, a number of criteria, characteristics, and principles for organic plant breeding and propagation techniques are listed by the authors for exclusion: Besides transgenesis all breeding methods resulting in mutants through chemicals like colchicine or gamma radiation, all methods not allowing a full life cycle of the plant, and all methods manipulating the genome of the organisms etc. should be excluded.

Unfortunately, the authors completely miss the point that the structure and assembly of DNA has been changed heavily over the decades and centuries of traditional breeding. Modern wheat in all its variants and traits used today – also by organic farmers – is a product of processes, wherein the "intrinsic value of the genomic naturalness" has been completely ignored and any imaginable change has been successfully integrated. In an extensive study 58 major types of chromosomal rearrangements have been found (Badaeva et al., 2007) alone in wheat. As a matter of fact, most major crops have been subject to a multitude of genomic changes and chromosomal inversions, translocations etc. The reality is, whether we accept it for any kind of definition or not, that most of the principles on the molecular level advocated by (Van Bueren, E. T. L. & Struik, 2004, 2005; Van Bueren, E.T.L. et al., 2002; Van Bueren, E. T. L. et al., 2003; Verhoog et al., 2003) are clearly violated by almost all existing modern crop traits and cannot be redone, unless one could theoretically return to the mostly vanished ancestral traits with all their dramatic disadvantages.

Genetic information is frequently disturbed by introduction of modified or mismatch bases into duplex DNA, and hence all organisms contain DNA repair systems to restore normal genetic information by removing such damaged bases or nucleotides and replacing them by correct ones. (Baarends et al., 2001; Morikawa & Shirakawa, 2001)

So, in reality, the principle of the 'intrinsic values of the plant genome' is a fiction and not based on the science. Also the working papers of FIBL, authored by Karutz, do not really help here, since they avoid going into modern molecular biology (Karutz, Christine, 1999; Karutz, C., 1999).

The whole concept of violation of the intrinsic naturalness of the genome by inserting alien genes from other species across the natural species barrier is also falsified by the occurrence of a naturally transgenic grass: see the case of a naturally transgenic grass discussed by (Ghatnekar et al., 2006).

It is questionable to stress the overcoming of natural hybridization barriers by genetic engineering, since this has been done by traditional breeding methods in former decades. There is the example of 'somatic hybridization' (i.e. non-sexual fusion of two somatic cells). The advantage of this method is that by the fusion of cells with different numbers of chromosomes (for instance different species of Solanum) fertile products of the crossing can be obtained at once because diploid cells are being somatically fused. Polyploid plants are obtained containing all the chromosomes of both parents instead of the usual half set of chromosomes from each after meiosis. For this, cells are required whose cell walls have been enzymatically removed and are only enclosed by a membrane (protoplasts). With the loss of their cell walls, protoplasts have also lost their typical shape and are spherical like egg cells. This mixture of cells to be fused is then exposed to electric pulses. In order to get from the cell mixture the 'right' product of the fusion (since fusion of two cells from similar plants can also occur) one different selectable character in each of the original plants is necessary, parallel to the methods used in transgenesis. Only cells that survive this double selection are genuine products of fusion. Protoplast fusion has been investigated and applied to potatoes and citrus fruits, e.g. (Miranda et al., 1997; Nouri-Ellouz et al., 2006; Przetakiewicz et al., 2007) . In the EU, regulations cover the deliberate release of genetically modified organisms into the environment, but somatic hybrids are not considered as GMO's and do not require authorization. The most recent draft of the EU organic regulations in which the introduction of GMO's into organic cultivation is forbidden, follows the above definition.

Moreover, the concept of violated intrinsic naturalness of the genomes by transgenity is falsified by the publications of Arber, (Nobel Laureate 1978), where he compared designed genetic alterations (including genetic engineering) with the spontaneous genetic variation known to form the substrate for biological evolution (Arber, 2000):

"Interestingly, naturally occurring molecular evolution, i.e. the spontaneous generation of genetic variants has been seen to follow exactly the same three strategies as those used in genetic engineering. These three strategies are:

(a) small local changes in the nucleotide sequences,
(b) internal reshuffling of genomic DNA segments, and
(c) acquisition of usually rather small segments of DNA from another type of organism by horizontal gene transfer."

See also (Arber, 2002, 2003, 2004) and also (Trewavas & Leaver, 2000) in writings which confirm this important comparison on the genomic level of evolutionary and modern plant breeding processes. But there are of course, despite all the similarities, some major differences: Natural mutation acts in a natural time scale, i.e. under most circumstances the mutants will need hundreds if not hundreds of thousands of years to overcome selective processes in nature until they really succeed and take over against their natural competitors. This is different with the transgenic crop products: they run through an R&D phase, the transgenesis is done in a targeted way, and the regulatory process takes about 10 to 20 years until the crops are being deregulated. But somewhere along this process they will be propagated to the millions in the field, covering in a evolutionary extremely short time span millions of hectares.

This basic insight of a molecular biologist (more details in (Ammann, 2007) has been confirmed by analysis of modern breeding processes and their real products in crops, as an example here a comparison on the genomic level between transgenic and non-transgenic wheat traits (Shewry et al., 2006): conventional plant breeding involves the selection of novel combinations of many thousands of genes, transgenesis allows the production of lines which differ from the parental lines in the expression of only single or small numbers of genes, Consequently it should in principle be easier to predict the effects of transgenes than to unravel the multiple differences which exist between new, conventionally-produced cultivars and their parents.

The above statements are confirmed by other genomic studies (Barcelo et al., 2001; Batista et al., 2008; Baudo et al., 2006) – they could be extended to other methods of transformation, such as direct insertion of DNA fragments (Paszkowski et al., 1984) and, with some questions about long term stability, also to the agrobacterium mediated transformations (Maghuly et al., 2007). But what is really interesting in the present context, that it has been demonstrated (Baudo et al., 2006) that overall, genome disturbances in traditional breeding in comparable cases are measured to be greater than in transformation. It is suggested that the presence of the transgenes does not significantly alter gene expression and that, at this level of investigation, transgenic plants could be considered substantially equivalent to the untransformed parental lines on the genomic level.

In a most recent publication about the same issue, (Batista et al., 2008) the same conclusion is drawn:

"We found that the improvement of a plant variety through the acquisition of a new desired trait, using either mutagenesis or transgenesis, may cause stress and thus lead to an altered expression of untargeted genes. In all of the cases studied, the observed alteration was more extensive in mutagenized than in transgenic plants. We propose that the safety assessment of improved plant varieties should be carried out on a case-by-case basis and not simply restricted to foods obtained through genetic engineering."

On another argumentation line, there are papers published claiming that transgenesis or the insertion of promoters in transgenic plants could be the reason for DNA scrambling mutational disturbances (Latham et al., 2006), but the publications lack a fundamental demand for such conclusions: a comparison with non-transgenic crops. The same syndrome of lacking comparison applies to another study (Myhre et al., 2006), claiming that the 35S promoter frequently used to enhance transgene expression is demonstrating some activity in cultures of human cells. The authors just 'forget' to tell the readers, that the very same promoter is part of daily diets including *Brassicaceae* (whether transgenic or non-transgenic).

The consequences of the above are, that organic farming – using the argument of artificial DNA breeding disturbance, should opt for the transgenic crops in specific cases. Another consequence is that transgenic crops of the first generation should never have been subjected to regulation purely based on methodology; rather it would have been wiser to have a close look at the products in each case, as John Maddox already proposed in 1992 in an editorial in Nature (Anonymous, 1992). This is also roughly the *view of Canadian regulators (Andree, 2002; Berwald et al., 2006). In the case of the Golden Rice this has serious ethical consequences, because each year lost to unreasonable and unscientific regulation causes the hundreds of thousands of deaths due to severe vitamin A deficiency, especially among the children of developing countries of South Eastern Asia. In Europe this kind of unscientific regulatory basis hinders the development of transgenic crop breeding for the benefit of a more ecological production. In particular it hampers public research considerably, see www.pubresreg.org And on top of this the organic farming industry does not shy away from false and often hypocritical propaganda against genetically engineered crops for the sake of marketing their own products.*

5. The concept of the green and evergreen revolution in agriculture as opposed to organic farming

Two names are linked to the Green Revolution with all its incomparable success: Norman Borlaug (Peace Nobel Price 1970) (Borlaug et al., 1969) and Monkombu Sambasivan Swaminathan, World Food Price Laureate 1987 (Reynolds & Borlaug, 2006a, 2006b; Swaminathan, M. S., 1972; Swaminathan, Monkombu Sambasivan, 2006).

Assessments (DeGregori, 2004; Evenson & Gollin, 2003) of the Green Revolution came up with the following summary: Over the period 1960 to 2000, international agricultural research centers, in collaboration with national research programs, contributed to the development of "modern varieties" for many crops. These varieties have contributed to large increases in crop production. Productivity gains, however, have been uneven across crops and regions. Consumers generally benefited from declines in food prices. Farmers benefited only where cost reductions exceeded price reductions.

Very early, Swaminathan (Swaminathan, M.S., 1968) warned from unwelcome developments related to the Green Revolution:

"The initiation of exploitive agriculture without a proper understanding of the various consequences of every one of the changes introduced into traditional agriculture, and without first building up a proper scientific and training base to sustain it, may only lead us, in the long run, into an era of agricultural disaster rather than one of agricultural prosperity." [see also a later publication with details: (Kesavan & Iyer, 2014), added by the author 6 years after publication of this text].

After the unique success of the Green Revolution detrimental effects (upsurge of pest insects, growing insect resistance against widely used pesticides and negative effects on the soil fertility and a rising number of herbicide resistant weeds), Swaminathan called for an *Evergreen Revolution* already in 1968 and 1990 (Kesavan & Swaminathan, 2006; Swaminathan, Monkombu Sambasivan, 2006): higher productivity in perpetuity needs a new emphasis on better infrastructure, crop rotation, sustainable management of natural resources and progressive enhancement of soil fertility and overall biodiversity.

Biotechnology has proven to be helpful to contribute to the evergreen revolution, since it helps to enhance some ecological factors, some review papers give lots of facts about this statement (Ammann, 2005; Cerdeira, A.L. & Duke, 2006; Cerdeira, A. L. et al., 2007; Fawcett, RS et al., 1994; Paarlberg, 2000; Sanvido et al., 2006). Biotechnology has proven to reduce pesticide use, having positive influence on non-target insect populations, helped to introduce no-tillage management beneficial to soil fertility: Numerous scientific studies give prove of those benefits for soil fertility (Bonny, 2008; Fawcett, R. & Towery, 2002; Schier, 2006; Wang et al., 2008).

An emerging variant of industrial farming is developing rapidly in the United States: Its called Precision Farming, it's a management system based mainly on satellite monitoring, it helps saving energy and time and can lead to a more ecological farming with higher yield (Godwin et al., 2003; Kitchen, 2008; Leithold & Traphan, 2006; Shanahan et al., 2008; Slaughter et al., 2008; Thenkabail, 2003; Thomas et al., 2007). Methods of precision farming, applied in an acceptable manner, do not directly contradict the main rules in organic and integrated farming and should seriously be considered as helpful auxiliary methods.

Overall, modern breeding, together with the strategies of the Evergreen Crop Revolution has proven to be beneficial for the environment, and there is a clear future convergence coming up with organic and integrated farming.

Cited Literature

Altieri, M. A., & Nicholls, C. I. (2003). Soil fertility management and insect pests: harmonizing soil and plant health in agroecosystems. *Soil & Tillage Research, 72*(2), pp. 203-211. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000184217600009 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Biotech-Biodiv/Altieri-Soil-fertility-Pests-2003.pdf

Ammann, K. (2005). Effects of biotechnology on biodiversity: herbicide-tolerant and insect-resistant GM crops. *Trends in Biotechnology, 23*(8), pp. 388-394. <Go to ISI>://000231342700005 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/TIBTECH/Ammann-TIBTECH-Biodiversity-2005.pdf

Ammann, K. (2007). Reconciling Traditional Knowledge with Modern Agriculture: A Guide for Building Bridges. In A. Krattiger, Mahoney, R.T.L., Nelsen, L., Thompson, G. A., Bennett, A.B., Satyanarayana, K., Graff, G.D., Fernandez, C., Kowalsky, S.P. (Ed.), *Intellectual Property Management in Health and Agricultural Innovation a handbook of best practices, Chapter 16.7* (pp.1539-1559). Oxford, U.K. and Davis, USA: MIHR, PIPRA The general link to the www.ipHandbook.org. (as of September 2007) AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/IP/Press-Release-ipHandbook-Online-20071101.pdf, AND the Flyer: http://www.ask-force.org/web/Patents/ipHandbook-Flyer1.pdf AND chapter 16.7 http://www.ask-force.org/web/TraditionalKnowledge/Ammann-Traditional-Biotech-2007.pdf free of copyrights AND the exported bibliography with the links: http://www.ask-force.org/web/TraditionalKnowledge/Exported-Bibliography-links-Ammann-2007.pdf

Ammann K. in:, Wolfenbarger, L., Andow DA. and Hilbeck, A., Nickson, T., Wu, F., Thompson, B., & Ammann, K. (2004). Biosafety in agriculture: is it justified to compare directly with natural habitats ? *Frontiers in Ecology, Forum: GM crops: balancing predictions of promise and peril.* from www.frontiersinecology.org and http://www.botanischergarten.ch/Frontiers-Ecology/Ammann-Forum-def1.pdf

Andree, P. (2002). The biopolitics of genetically modified organisms in Canada. *Journal of Canadian Studies-Revue D Etudes Canadiennes, 37*(3), pp. 162-191. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000236751100009 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Regulation/Andree-Biopolitics--GMO-Canada.pdf

Anonymous. (1992). Products pose no special risks just because of the processes used to make them. *Nature, 356*(6364), pp. 1-2. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/356001b0 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Regulation/Anonymous-US-Regulation-Nature-1992.pdf

Arber, W. (2000). Genetic variation: molecular mechanisms and impact on microbial evolution. *Fems Microbiology Reviews, 24*(1), pp. 1-7. <Go to ISI>://000084915900001 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Mutations/Arber-Gen-Variation-FEMS-2000.pdf

Arber, W. (2002). Roots, strategies and prospects of functional genomics. *Current Science, 83*(7), pp. 826-828. <Go to ISI>://000178662800019 and http://www.ask-force.org/web/Mutations/Arber-Comparison-2002.pdf

Arber, W. (2003). Elements for a theory of molecular evolution. *Gene, 317*(1-2), pp. 3-11. <Go to ISI>://000186667000002 and http://www.ask-force.org/web/Mutations/Arber-Gene-317-2003.pdf

Arber, W. (2004). Biological evolution: Lessons to be learned from microbial population biology and genetics. *Research in Microbiology, 155*(5), pp. 297-300. <Go to ISI>://000222736200001 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Mutations/Arber-Evolution-Lessons-2004.pdf

Avery, A. (2006). *The Truth About Organic Foods*. pp. 231: Henderson Communications, L.L.C.; 1st edition (2006). ISBN-10: 0978895207 AND ISBN-13: 978-0978895204 http://www.amazon.com/Truth-About-Organic-Foods/dp/0978895207/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1435324332&sr=8-1&keywords=Avery+The+Truth+About+Organic+Foods Bibl. KA

Avery, A. (2007). "Organic Abundance" Report: Fatally Flawed. from http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Avery-Hudson-Institute-organic-rebuttal-2007a.pdf

Baarends, W. M., van der Laan, R., & Grootegoed, J. A. (2001). DNA repair mechanisms and gametogenesis. *Reproduction, 121*(1), pp. 31-39. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000168328900004 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Genomics/Baarends-DNA-Repair-Mechanisms-2001.pdf

Badaeva, E. D., Dedkova, O. S., Gay, G., Pukhalskyi, V. A., Zelenin, A. V., Bernard, S., & Bernard, M. (2007). Chromosomal rearrangements in wheat: their types and distribution. *Genome, 50*, pp. 907-926. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000250807000003 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Genomics/Badaeva-Wheat-Chromos-Rearrangements-2007.pdf

Badgley, C., Moghtadera, J., Quineroa, E., Zadema, E., Chappella, M. J., Aviles-Vazqueza, K., Samulona, A., & Perfecto, I. (2007). Organic agriculture and the global food supply, (including rebuttals from Kenneth Cassman and Jim Hendrix). *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems, 22*(Published online by Cambridge University Press 04Jul2007), pp. 86-108. doi:10.1017/S1742170507001640 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Badgley-Feed-World-2007.pdf AND separate rebuttal of Alex Avery from the Hudson Institute: http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Avery-Hudson-Institute-organic-rebuttal-2007a.pdf

Barcelo, P., Rasco-Gaunt, S., Thorpe, C., & Lazzeri, P. (2001). Transformation and gene expression. In P. R. Shewry, P. A. Lazzeri, & K. J. Edwards (Eds.), *Advances in botanical research incorporating advances in plant pathology* (Vol. 34, pp.59–126) http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0120059347?psc=1&redirect=true&ref_=od_aui_detailpages00 Bibl. KA AND chapter Barcelo http://www.ask-force.org/web/Ecology/Barcelo-Transformation-Gene-Expression-2001.pdf

Batista, R., Saibo, N., Lourenco, T., & Oliveira, M. M. (2008). Microarray analyses reveal that plant mutagenesis may induce more transcriptomic changes than transgene insertion. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 105*(9), pp. 3640-3645. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000253846500082 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Genomics/Batista-Microarray-Analysis-2008.pdf AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Genomics/Transgenesis-Comparison-Slides.pdf AND Http://www.ask-force.org/web/Genomics/Transgenesis-Comparison-Slides.ppt

Baudo, M. M., Lyons, R., Powers, S., Pastori, G. M., Edwards, K. J., Holdsworth, M. J., & Shewry, P. R. (2006). Transgenesis has less impact on the transcriptome of wheat grain than conventional breeding. *Plant Biotechnology Journal, 4*(4), pp. 369-380. <Go to ISI>://000238256500001 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Baudo-Impact-2006.pdf AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Genomics/Transgenesis-Comparison-Slides.pdf AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Genomics/Transgenesis-Comparison-Slides.ppt

Bengtsson, J., Ahnstrom, J., & Weibull, A. C. (2005). The effects of organic agriculture on biodiversity and abundance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 42*(2), pp. 261-269. <Go to ISI>://000228396600008 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Bengtson-Effects-organic-Biodiversity-2005.pdf

Berwald, D., Carter, C. A., & Gruere, G. P. (2006). Rejecting new technology: The case of genetically modified wheat. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 88*(2), pp. 432-447. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000236716200012 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Regulation/Berwald-Rejecting-New-Technology-2006.pdf

Bonny, S. (2008). Genetically modified glyphosate-tolerant soybean in the USA: adoption factors, impacts and prospects. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 28*(1), pp. 21-32. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000253779900003 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Soya/Bonny-Soy-review-USA-2008.pdf

Borlaug, N. E., Narvaez, I., Aresvik, O., & Anderson, R. G. (1969). Green Revolution Yields a Golden Harvest. *Columbia Journal of World Business, 4*(5), pp. 9-19. <Go to ISI>://A1969Y496900005 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Borlaug-GreenRevolution-1969.pdf

Brouwer Floor, & Lowe Philiip. (2000). *CAP Regimes and the European Countryside. Prospects for Integration between Agricultural, Regional and Environmental Policies*. (ISBN 0-85199-354-0). Oxon, Wallingford, UK: CABI Publishing Retrieved from Sample https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=7kmRS7vh0dQC&printsec=frontcover&output=reader&hl=en_GB&pg=GBS.PR3 AND Amazon https://books.google.ch/books?id=7kmRS7vh0dQC&dq=Brouwer+CAP+Regimes+and+the+European+Countryside&lr=&source=gbs_navlinks_.

Cerdeira, A. L., & Duke, S. O. (2006). The Current Status and Environmental Impacts of Glyphosate-Resistant Crops: A Review. *Journal of Environmental Quality, 35*, pp. 1633–1658. doi:10.2134/jeq2005.0378 AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/HerbizideTol/Cerdeira-Status-2006.pdf

Cerdeira, A. L., Gazziero, D. L. P., Duke, S. O., Matallo, M. B., & Spadotto, C. A. (2007). Review of potential environmental impacts of transgenic glyphosate-resistant soybean in Brazil. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health Part B-Pesticides Food Contaminants and Agricultural Wastes, 42*(5), pp. 539-549. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000247652600009 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/HerbizideTol/Cerdeira-Review-Potential-2007.pdf

Clemetsen, M., & van Laar, J. (2000). The contribution of organic agriculture to landscape quality in the Sogn og Fjordane region of Western Norway. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 77*(1-2), pp. 125-141. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6T3Y-3Y21TSP-C/2/94e4d1fb27c784c19fe8f32e1c4bb6ad AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Clemetsen-Landscape-Aurland-2000.pdf

Cohen, J. I. (2005). Poorer nations turn to publicly developed GM crops. *Nature Biotechnology, 23*(1), pp. 27-33. <Go to ISI>://000226195700017 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Developing/Cohen-Naturebiotech-2005.pdf AND errata: http://www.ask-force.org/web/Developing/Cohen-Naturebiotech-errata-2005.pdf

DeGregori, T. R. (2004). Green revolution myth and agricultural reality? *Journal of Economic Issues, 38*(2), pp. 503-508. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000222062400022 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/DeGregori-Green-Revolution-Myth-2004.pdf

Dhlamini, Z., Spillane, C., Moss, J., Ruane, J., Urquia, J., & Sonnino, A. (2005). *Status of Research and Application of Crop Technologies in Developing Countries, Preliminary Assessment* pp. 62 Rome ISBN/ISSN FAO Retrieved from http://www.ask-force.org/web/FAO/Status-FAO-GMcrops-2005.pdf

Dollaker, A. (2006). Conserving biodiversity alongside agricultural profitability through integrated R&D approaches and responsible use of crop protection products. *Pflanzenschutz-Nachrichten Bayer, 59*(1), pp. 117-134

Dollaker, A. (2007). *Biodiversity and the Plant Science Industry, Managing natural resources sustainably in agriculture* pp. 32 ISBN/ISSN Crop Life International, Bayer Crop Science AG Retrieved from www.croplife.org

Dollaker, A., & Rhodes, C. (2007). Integrating crop productivity and biodiversity conservation pilot initiatives developed by Bayer CropScience, in Weed Science in Time of Transition. *Crop Science, 26*(3), pp. 408-416. http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Dollaker-2007.pdf

Evenson, R. E., & Gollin, D. (2003). Assessing the Impact of the Green Revolution, 1960 to 2000. *Science, 300*(5620), pp. 758-762. http://www.sciencemag.org/content/300/5620/758.abstract AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/India/Evenson-Assessing-Impact-Green-Revolution-2003.pdf

Fawcett, R., Christensen, B., & Tierney, D. (1994). The impact of conservation tillage on pesticide runoff into surface water.*, 49*, pp. 126-135. http://www.scientific-alliance.org/scientist_writes_items/benefits_no_till.htm

Fawcett, R., & Towery, D. (2002). Conservation tillage and plant biotechnology: How new technologies can improve the environment by reducing the need to plow. Retrieved not accessible anymore, 2003, from www.ctic.purdue.edu/CTIC/CTIC.html or http://www.ask-force.org/web/HerbizideTol/Fawcett-BiotechPaper.pdf

Firbank, L. G. (1988). Agrostemma Githago L. (Lychnis Githago (L.) Scop.). *Journal of Ecology, 76*(4), pp. 1232-1246. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2260645 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Biotech-Biodiv/Firbank-Agrostemma-Githago-1988.pdf

Fliessbach, A., Mader, P., Dubois, D., Gunst, L., Stauffer, W., Fried, P., Pfiffner, L., Alföldi, T., & Niggli, U. (2000). *Organic Farming enhances soil fertility and biodiversity* pp. 16 Frick, Switzerland ISBN/ISSN Research Institute of Organic Agriculture, Federal Research Station for Agroecology and Agriculture Retrieved from http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/DOC_slim.pdf AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/DOC-slim-Slides.ppt

Ghatnekar, L., Jaarola, M., & Bengtsson, B. O. (2006). The introgression of a functional nuclear gene from Poa to Festuca ovina. *Proceedings: Biological Sciences, 273*(1585), pp. 395 - 399. http://www.ask-force.org/web/Genomics/Ghatnekar-Transgen-Festuca.pdf

Godwin, R. J., Wood, G. A., Taylor, J. C., Knight, S. M., & Welsh, J. P. (2003). Precision farming of cereal crops: a review of a six year experiment to develop management guidelines. *Biosystems Engineering, 84*(4), pp. 375-391. <Go to ISI>://000182703700002 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Precision-Biotechnology/Godwin-Precision-Farming-Cereal-Crops-2003.pdf

Goklany, I., Mader P. et al., & Zoebl, D. (2002). Organic farming and energy efficiency. *Science, 298*(5600), pp. 1890-1891. <Go to ISI>://000179629200016 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Zoebl-Reply-2002.pdf AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Goklany-Maeder-Science-2002-p1890.pdf

Graham, R. D., Welch, R. M., Saunders, D. A., Ortiz-Monasterio, I., Bouis, H. E., Bonierbale, M., de Haan, S., Burgos, G., Thiele, G., Liria, R., Meisner, C. A., Beebe, S. E., Potts, M. J., Kadian, M., Hobbs, P. R., Gupta, R. K., & Twomlow, S. (2007). Nutritious subsistence food systems. *Advances in Agronomy, Vol 92, 92*, pp. 1-74. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000243626600001 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Biofortification/Graham-Subsistence-Food-Systems-2008.pdf

Grashof-Bokdam, C. J., & van Langevelde, F. (2005). Green Veining: Landscape Determinants of Biodiversity in European Agricultural Landscapes. *Landscape Ecology, 20*(4), pp. 417-439. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10980-004-5646-1 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Biotech-Biodiv/Grashof-Bokdam-Green-veining-landscape-biodiversity-2004.pdf

Guthman Julie. (1998). Regulating meaning, appropriating nature: The codification of California organic agriculture. *Antipode, 30*(2), pp. 135-+. <Go to ISI>://000073772300004 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Guthman-Standards-1998.pdf

Guthman Julie. (2004). *Agrarian Dreams, The Paradox of Organic Farming in California* pp. 264: University of California Press; 1 edition (August 4, 2004) ISBN-10: 0520240952 AND ISBN-13: 978-0520240957 AND ASIN: B00L3OA9GC http://www.amazon.de/s?_encoding=UTF8&field-keywords=Agrarian%20Dreams%3A%20The%20Paradox%20of%20Organic%20Farming%20in%20California%20(California%20Studies%20in%20Critical%20Human%20Geography)&node=530484031 Bibll. KA Kindle

Häring, A. M., Dabbert, S., Aurbacher, J., Bichler, B., Eichert, C., Gambelli, D., Lampkin, N., Offermann, F., Olmos, S., Tuson, J., & Zanoli, R. (Eds.). (2004). *Organic farming and measures of European agricultural policy, 2004* Hohenheim: Prof Dr Stephan Dabbert, University of Hohenheim, Department of Farm Economics 410A. http://www.cababstractsplus.org/google/abstract.asp?AcNo=20043097042

Hole, D. G., Perkins, A. J., Wilson, J. D., Alexander, I. H., Grice, F., & Evans, A. D. (2005). Does organic farming benefit biodiversity? *Biological Conservation, 122*(1), pp. 113-130. <Go to ISI>://000225522100012 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Hole-Organic-biodiversity-2004.pdf

IFOAM. (2004a). *D1 Plant Breeding Draft Standards* pp. 2 Bonn ISBN/ISSN IFOAM, International Federation of Organic Agricultural Movements Retrieved from http://www.ifoam.org/about_ifoam/standards/norms/draft_standards/DraftPlantBreedingStandardsD1050729.pdf

IFOAM. (2004b). *D2 Draft Biodiversity and Landscape Standards* pp. 7 Bonn ISBN/ISSN IFOAM (International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements Retrieved from http://www.ifoam.org/about_ifoam/standards/norms/draft_standards/BiodiversityDraftStandardsD2050728.pdf

IFOAM. (2004c). *D3 Resource Use Draft Standards* pp. 7 Bonn ISBN/ISSN IFOAM (International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements Retrieved from http://www.ifoam.org/about_ifoam/standards/norms/draft_standards/ResourceUseDraftStandardsD3050728.pdf

IFOAM. (2005). *Definition of Organic Agriculture* pp. 12 Bonn ISBN/ISSN IFOAM, International Federation of Organic Agricultural Movements, proposals Retrieved from http://www.ifoam.org/organic_facts/doa/pdf/Definition_of_Organic_Agriculture_Report.pdf

IFOAM. (2007). Principles of Organic Farming. 2007, from http://www.ifoam.org/about_ifoam/principles/index.html

Karutz, C. (1999). Ecological cereal breeding and genetic engineering. 2003, from http://www.biogene.org/themen/saatgut/getengl.html#cont

Karutz, C. (1999). Ecological cereal breeding and genetic engineering, A Discussion Paper (original version in German). *Working Paper, Forschungsinstitut für biologischen Landbau (FIBL), CH-Frick.*, from http://orgprints.org/4881/01/Karutz-1999-Gentechnik-eng.pdf AND German version http://www.orgprints.org/4881/

Kesavan, P. C., & Iyer, R. D. (2014). M. S. Swaminathan: a journey from the frontiers of life sciences to the state of a 'Zero Hunger' world. *Current Science, 107*(12), pp. 2036-2051. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000347474400024 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/India/Kesavan-Swaminathan-Frontiers-Life-Sciences-2014.pdf

Kesavan, P. C., & Swaminathan, M. S. (2006). From green revolution to evergreen revolution: Pathways and terminologies. *Current Science, 91*(2), pp. 145-146. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000241623300001 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Swaminathan/Kesavan-Swaminathan-Green-Evergreen-2006.pdf

Kiers, E. T., Leakey, R. R. B., Izac, A. M., Heinemann, J. A., Rosenthal, E., Nathan, D., & Jiggins, J. (2008). Ecology - Agriculture at a crossroads. *Science, 320*(5874), pp. 320-321. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000255026100024 AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/IAASTD/Kiers-Crossroads-Science-2008.pdf

Kitchen, N. R. (2008). Emerging technologies for real-time and integrated agriculture decisions. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 61*(1), pp. 1-3. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6T5M-4PK8MDG-1/2/a8c7f273d388b1c599fb0c6ebeb6f6bf AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/Precision-Biotechnology/Kitchen-Emerging-Technologies-2008.pdf

Kleijn, D., Baquero, R. A., Clough, Y., Diaz, M., De Esteban, J., Fernandez, F., Gabriel, D., Herzog, F., Holzschuh, A., Johl, R., Knop, E., Kruess, A., Marshall, E. J. P., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Tscharntke, T., Verhulst, J., West, T. M., & Yela, J. L. (2006). Mixed biodiversity benefits of agri-environment schemes in five European countries. *Ecology Letters, 9*(3), pp. 243-254. <Go to ISI>://000235099600001 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Kleijn-Mixed-biodiversity-benefits-5-EU-2006.pdf

Koning, N. B. J., Van Ittersum, M. K., Becx, G. A., Van Boekel, M. A. J. S., Brandenburg, W. A., Van Den Broek, J. A., Goudriaan, J., Van Hofwegen, G., Jongeneel, R. A., Schiere, J. B., & Smies, M. (2008). Long-term global availability of food: continued abundance or new scarcity? *NJAS - Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences, 55*(3), pp. 229-292. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1573521408800012 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Food/Koning-Long-term-global-availability-food-2008.pdf

Lampkin, N., Foster, C., Padel, S., & Midmore, P. (Eds.). (1999). *The Policy and Regulatory Environment for Organic Farming in Europe* (Vol. 1)Hohenheim, Germany: European Union. http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Lampkin-organic-Farming-Regulation-EU-1999.pdf AND https://www.uni-hohenheim.de/i410a/ofeurope/organicfarmingineurope-vol1.pdf

Latham, J. R., Wilson, A. K., & Steinbrecher, R. A. (2006). The mutational consequences of plant transformation. *Journal of Biomedicine and Biotechnology, 2006*, pp. 1-7. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000240340700001 AND DOI 10.1155/JBB/2006/25376 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Mutations/Latham-mutational-consequence-2006.pdf

Leithold, P., & Traphan, K. (2006). On Farm Research (OFR) - a novel experimental design for Precision Farming. *Journal of Plant Diseases and Protection*, pp. 157-164. <Go to ISI>://000243263500020 AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/Precision-Biotechnology/Leithold-On-Farm-Research-2006.pdf

Mader, P., Fliessbach, A., Dubois, D., Gunst, L., Fried, P., & Niggli, U. (2002a). The ins and outs of organic farming, Response to Goklany I. *Science, 298*(5600), pp. 1889-1890. <Go to ISI>://000179629200015 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Goklany-Maeder-Science-2002-p1890.pdf AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Goklany--Ins--Outs-2002.pdf

Mader, P., Fliessbach, A., Dubois, D., Gunst, L., Fried, P., & Niggli, U. (2002b). Soil fertility and biodiversity in organic farming. *Science, 296*(5573), pp. 1694-1697. <Go to ISI>://000175976200061 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Maeder-Science-2002-p1694.pdf

Maghuly, F., da Câmara Machado, A., Leopold, S., Khan, M., Katinger, H., & Laimer, M. (2007). Long-term stability of marker gene expression in Prunus subhirtella: a model fruit tree species. *Journal of Biotechnology, 127*(2), pp. 310-321. http://www.ask-force.org/web/Marker-Genes/Maghuly-Marker-2006.pdf AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Facultyof1000/Maghuly-Long-term-Stability-2006.pdf

May, M. J., Champion, G. T., Dewar, A. M., Qi, A. M., & Pidgeon, J. D. (2005). Management of genetically modified herbicide-tolerant sugar beet for spring and autumn environmental benefit. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences, 272*(1559), pp. 111-119. <Go to ISI>://000226980800001 AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/Farmscale/May-Beet-FSE-2005.pdf

Mayer, J. E., Pfeiffer, W. H., & Beyer, P. (2008). Biofortified crops to alleviate micronutrient malnutrition. *Genome studies and Molecular Genetics, edited by Juliette de Meaux and Maarten Koornneef / Plant Biotechnology, edited by Andy Greenland and Jan Leach, 11*(2), pp. 166-170. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6VS4-4S0R701-1/1/e12139b40ae67abc932e4bdb46069503 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Rice/Mayer-Biofortified-COPB-2008..pdf

Miranda, M., Motomura, T., Ikeda, F., Ohgawara, T., Saito, W., Endo, T., Omura, M., & Moriguchi, T. (1997). Somatic hybrids obtained by fusion between Poncirus trifoliata (2x) and Fortunella hindsii (4x) protoplasts. *Plant Cell Reports, 16*(6), pp. 401-405. <Go to ISI>://A1997WN07400009 AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/Somatic-Hybrids/Miranda-somatic-Citrus-1997.pdf

Morikawa, K., & Shirakawa, M. (2001). Three-dimensional structural views of damaged-DNA recognition: T4 endonuclease V, E. coli Vsr protein, and human nucleotide excision repair factor XPA (vol 460, pg 257, 2000). *Mutation Research-DNA Repair, 485*(3), pp. 267-268. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000167838200009 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Genomics/Morikawa-Structural-Views-Damaged-DNA-2000.pdf

Murphy, M. (2008). IAASTD - Syngenta unlikely to rejoin Ag assesment. *Chemistry & Industry*(4), pp. 11-11. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000254195500016 AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/IAASTD/Murphy-Syngenta-unlikely-2008.pdf

Myhre, M. R., Fenton, K. A., Eggert, J., Nielsen, K. M., & Traavik, T. (2006). The 35S CaMV plant virus promoter is active in human enterocyte-like cells. *European Food Research and Technology, 222*(1-2), pp. 185-193. <Go to ISI>://000233722100028 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/S35/Myhre-Cauliflower-Active-2006.pdf

Nouri-Ellouz, O., Gargouri-Bouzid, R., Sihachakr, D., Triki, M. A., Ducreux, G., Drira, N., & Lakhoua, L. (2006). Production of potato intraspecific somatic hybrids with improved tolerance to PVY and Pythium aphanidermatum. *Journal of Plant Physiology, 163*(12), pp. 1321-1332. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000243505800012 AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/Somatic-Hybrids/Nouri-Ellouz-Production-Potato-intraspecific-2006.pdf

Paarlberg, R. (2000). Genetically modified crops in developing countries - Promise or peril? *Environment, 42*(1), pp. 19-27. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000084733000004 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Developing/Paarlberg-GM-crops-Developing-2000.pdf

Paszkowski, J., Shillito, R. D., Saul, M., Mandak, V., Hohn, T., Hohn, B., & Potrykus, I. (1984). Direct Gene-Transfer to Plants. *Embo Journal, 3*(12), pp. 2717-2722. <Go to ISI>://A1984TV16200001 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Transgenic/Paszkowski-Direct-1984.pdf

Perry, J. N., Firbank, L. G., Champion, G. T., Clark, S. J., Heard, M. S., May, M. J., Hawes, C., Squire, G. R., Rothery, P., Wolwod, I. P., & Pidgeon, J. D. (2004). Ban on triazine herbicides likely to reduce but not negate relative benefits of GMHT maize cropping. *Nature, 428*(6980), pp. 313-316. <Go to ISI>://000220250200042 and http://www.ask-force.org/web/Farmscale/Perry-et-al-Nature-0404.pdf

Perry, J. N., Rothery, P., Clark, S. J., Heard, M. S., & Hawes, C. (2003). Design, analysis and statistical power of the Farm-Scale Evaluations of genetically modified herbicide-tolerant crops. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 40*(1), pp. 17-31. <Go to ISI>://000180852600002 and http://www.ask-force.org/web/Farmscale/Perry-Design-Farm-Scale-2003.pdf

Przetakiewicz, J., Nadolska-Orczyk, A., Kuc, D., & Orczyk, W. (2007). Tetraploid somatic hybrids of potato (Solanum tuberosum L.) obtained from diploid breeding lines. *Cellular & Molecular Biology Letters, 12*(2), pp. 253-267. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000244674900009 AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/Somatic-Hybrids/Przetakiewicz-Tetraploid-Somatic-2006.pdf

Reynolds, M. P., & Borlaug, N. E. (2006a). Applying innovations and new technologies for international collaborative wheat improvement. *Journal of Agricultural Science, 144*, pp. 95-110. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000237983900001 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Wheat/Reynolds-Applying-Innovations-New-Technologies-Wheat-2006.pdf

Reynolds, M. P., & Borlaug, N. E. (2006b). Impacts of breeding on international collaborative wheat improvement. *Journal of Agricultural Science, 144*, pp. 3-17. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000237785600002 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Wheat/Reynolds-Impacts-breeding-international-2006.pdf

Sanvido, O., Stark, M., Romeis, J., & Bigler, F. (2006). *Ecological impacts of genetically modified crops, Experiences from ten years of experimental field research and commercial cultivation* pp. 108 Zürich Reckenholz ISBN/ISSN Agroscope Reckenholz-Tänikon Research Station ART, Reckenholzstrasse 191, CH-8046 Zurich, Phone +41 (0)44 377 71 11, Fax +41 (0)44 377 72 01, info@art.admin.ch, www.art.admin.ch 1. Retrieved from http://www.ask-force.org/web/Environment/Sanvido-Agroscope-2006.pdf

Schier, A. (2006). Field study on the occurrence of ground beetles and spiders in genetically modified, herbicide tolerant corn in conventional and conservation tillage systems. *Journal of Plant Diseases and Protection, 113*(3), pp. 101-113. <Go to ISI>://000243263500014 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Bt/Schier-Comparison-2006.pdf

Shanahan, J. F., Kitchen, N. R., Raun, W. R., & Schepers, J. S. (2008). Responsive in-season nitrogen management for cereals. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 61*(1), pp. 51-62. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6T5M-4PJD9HB-2/2/a9f16652f5d3dce4313ad549ef8920f8 AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/Precision-Biotechnology/Shanahan-Responsive-in-Season-2008.pdf

Shewry, P. R., Powers, S., Field, J. M., Fido, R. J., Jones, H. D., Arnold, G. M., West, J., Lazzeri, P. A., Barcelo, P., Barro, F., Tatham, A. S., Bekes, F., Butow, B., & Darlington, H. (2006). Comparative field performance over 3 years and two sites of transgenic wheat lines expressing HMW subunit transgenes. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics, 113*(1), pp. 128-136. <Go to ISI>://000238345000016 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Shewry-Performance-2006.pdf

Slaughter, D. C., Giles, D. K., & Downey, D. (2008). Autonomous robotic weed control systems: A review. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 61*(1), pp. 63-78. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6T5M-4PJD9HB-1/2/596cd7c37a5d009bc42b648db5c2b02e AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Precision-Biotechnology/Slaughter-Autonomous-robotic-Weed-2008.pdf

Smith, E., & Marsden, T. (2004). Exploring the limits to growth in UK organics: beyond the statistical image. *Journal of Rural Studies, 20*(3), pp. 345-357. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6VD9-4CNTF8N-7/2/53e514bc2134230c99df440a2721d369 AND doi:10.1016/S0743-0167(03)00044-5 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Smith-Exploring-Limits-Organics-UK-2004.pdf

Stehlik, I., Caspersen, J. P., Wirth, L. E. A., & Holderegger, R. (2007). Floral free fall in the Swiss lowlands: environmental determinants of local plant extinction in a peri-urban landscape. *Journal of Ecology, 95*(4 %R doi:10.1111/j.1365-

2745.2007.01246.x), pp. 734-744. http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2007.01246.x AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/TraditionalKnowledge/Stehlik-Free-Fall-2007.pdf

Steiner, R. (1958). *Agriculture, 1st. Edition, A Course of Eight Lectures* Shrewsbury, UK. and Biodynamic Agriculture Association in London: Wilding and Son Ltd.and Biodynamic Agriculture Association Londonhttp://fvn-archiv.net/PDF/GA/GA327.pdf AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Steiner-Landwirtschaftlicher-Kurs-1924.pdf AND english: http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Steiner-Agriculture_A_Course_of_Lectures_Held_at_Koberwitz-Silesia-1924.mobi Kindle

Stokstad, E. (2008). Dueling visions for a hungry world. *Science, 319*(5869), pp. 1474-1476. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000253943800010 AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/IAASTD/Stokstad-IAASTD-Report-2008.pdf AND small correction http://www.botanischergarten.ch/IAASTD/Stokstad-IAASTD-Report-2008-correction.pdf

Swaminathan, M. S. (1968). *The age of algeny, genetic destruction of yield barriers and agricultural transformation. Part II. Presidential Address, Varanasi Indien Science Congress.* Paper presented at the Section of Agricultural Sciences Proceedings 55th Indian Science Congr.Jan. 1968., Varanasi, India. Original text not available, later comments on his statements from 1968 in http://www.ask-force.org/web/India/Kesavan-Swaminathan-Frontiers-Life-Sciences-2014.pdf

Swaminathan, M. S. (1972). Agriculture Cannot Wait. *Current Science, 41*(16), pp. 583-&. <Go to ISI>://A1972N264500001 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Swaminathan-Agriculture-1972.pdf AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/India/Swaminathan-Agriculture-cannot-wait-1972-alpha.pdf

Swaminathan, M. S. (2006). An Evergreen Revolution. *Crop Sci %R 10.2135/cropsci2006.9999, 46*(5), pp. 2293-2303. http://crop.scijournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/46/5/2293 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Swaminathan-Evergreen-2006.pdf

Taverne, D. (2007). *The March of Unreason: Science, Democracy, and the New Fundamentalism* http://www.amazon.com/March-Unreason-Science-Democracy-Fundamentalism/dp/0199205620/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1219505807&sr=1-1

Thenkabail, P. S. (2003). Biophysical and yield information for precision farming from near-real-time and historical Landsat TM images. *International Journal of Remote Sensing, 24*(14), pp. 2879-2904. <Go to ISI>://000184046300004 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Precision-Biotechnology/Thenkabail-Biophysical-Yield-Information-2003.pdf

Thomas, G. A., Titmarsh, G. W., Freebairn, D. M., & Radford, B. J. (2007). No-tillage and conservation farming practices in grain growing areas of Queensland - a review of 40 years of development. *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture, 47*(8), pp. 887-898. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000248021900001 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/HerbizideTol/Thomas-No-tillage-conservatioin-review-2007.pdf

Trewavas, A. (2001). Urban myths of organic farming. *Nature, 410*(6827), pp. 409-410. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000167583800016 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Trewavas-Urban-Myths-2001.pdf

Trewavas, A. (2004). A critical assessment of organic farming-and-food assertions with particular respect to the UK and the potential environmental benefits of no-till agriculture. *Crop Protection, 23*(9), pp. 757-781. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6T5T-4BWCBY3-3/2/f390dfb7327b535399b154bddb04580d AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Trewavas-critical-Assessment-2004.pdf

Trewavas, A., & Leaver, C. (2000). How nature itself uses genetic modification. *Nature, 403*(6765), pp. 12-12. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000084687400013 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Trewavas-How-Nature-2000.pdf

Van Bueren, E. T. L., & Struik, P. C. (2004). The consequences of the concept of naturalness for organic plant breeding and propagation. *Njas-Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences, 52*(1), pp. 85-95. <Go to ISI>://000226051800007 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Van-Bueren-Consequences-2004.pdf

Van Bueren, E. T. L., & Struik, P. C. (2005). Integrity and rights of plants: Ethical notions in organic plant breeding and propagation. *Journal of Agricultural & Environmental Ethics, 18*(5), pp. 479-493. <Go to ISI>://000231949300003 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Van-Bueren-Ethical-2005.pdf

Van Bueren, E. T. L., Struik, P. C., & Jacobsen, E. (2002). Ecological concepts in organic farming and their consequences for an organic crop ideotype. *Netherlands Journal of Agricultural Science, 50*(1), pp. 1-26. <Go to ISI>://000181462100001 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Van-Bueren-Lammerts-ecological-concepts-2002.pdf

Van Bueren, E. T. L., Struik, P. C., Tiemens-Hulscher, M., & Jacobsen, E. (2003). Concepts of intrinsic value and integrity of plants in organic plant breeding and propagation. *Crop Science, 43*(6), pp. 1922-1929. <Go to ISI>://000186477700003 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Van-Bueren-Intrinsic-2003.pdf

Van Montagu, M. (2008). Open letter to the organisations and governments involved in the International Assessment of Agricultural Science, and Technology for Development (IAASTD). Brussels: Public Research and Regulation Initiative. http://pubresreg.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=416 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/IAASTD/PRRI-letterIAASTD-200801.pdf

Verhoog, H., Matze, M., Van Bueren, E. L., & Baars, T. (2003). The role of the concept of the natural (naturalness) in organic farming. *Journal of Agricultural & Environmental Ethics, 16*(1), pp. 29-49. <Go to ISI>://000180441900002 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Verhoog-Naturalness-2003.pdf

Volker, K. (1992). ADAPTED FARMING SYSTEMS FOR A RURAL LANDSCAPE - A SOCIAL TYPOLOGY OF DUTCH FARMERS. *Sociologia Ruralis, 32*(1), pp. 146-162. <Go to ISI>://WOS:A1992HW11500010 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Volker-Adapted-Farming-Systems-1992.pdf

Wang, Q. L., Bai, Y. H., Gao, H. W., He, J., Chen, H., Chesney, R. C., Kuhn, N. J., & Li, H. W. (2008). Soil chemical properties and microbial biomass after 16 years of no-tillage fanning on the Loess Plateau, China. *Geoderma, 144*(3-4), pp. 502-508. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000255343800011 AND http://www.botanischergarten.ch/Tillage/Wang-No-tillage-China-2008.pdf

Watson, C. A., Atkinson, D., Gosling, P., Jackson, L. R., & Rayns, F. W. (2002). Managing soil fertility in organic farming systems. *Soil Use and Management, 18*(s1 %R doi:10.1111/j.1475-2743.2002.tb00265.x), pp. 239-247. http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1475-2743.2002.tb00265.x AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Watson-Soil-2002.pdf

Willer Helga, Minous Yousseffi-Menzler, & Neil Sorensen (Eds.). (2008). *The World Of Organic Agriculture Statistics And Emerging Trends 2008* International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM) Bonn, Germany and Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL), Frick, Switzerland http://www.organicworld.net/2008-corrigenda.asp AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Willer-IFOAM-World-Organic-Ag-Statistics-2008.pdf

Wood, D., & Lenne, J. (2001). Nature's fields: a neglected model for increasing food production. *Outlook on Agriculture, 30*(3), pp. 161-170. <Go to ISI>://000171396200003 AND http://www.ask-force.org/web/Organic/Wood-Natures-Fields-2001.pdf

Klaus Ammann, Guest Prof. Delft University of Technology, Julianalaan 67, NL-2628 BC Delft, Netherlands,

Full-text links missing are added 20150627