

THE EUROPEAN UNION, THE UNITED STATES, AND THE GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS (GMOs)

¹Anisa, ²Chelsyia, ³Grace Yohana, ⁴Mucco Eva, ⁵Morry Zefanya, ⁶Nadila

¹²³⁴⁵⁶International Relations, Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

¹*1770750027@ms.uki.ac.id*, ²*chlsy1898@gmail.com*, ³*1770750045@ms.uki.ac.id*, ⁴*1770750085@ms.uki.ac.id*,
⁵*1770750075@ms.uki.ac.id*, ⁶*1770750015@ms.uki.ac.id*

Abstract

Current technological advances have been present in all aspects of human life, including technological advances in biotechnology. Biotechnology not only raises hope for science but also raises heated debates among scientists, especially between the European Union and the US. This debate arises because of differences in perspective between the EU and the US. The EU has stringent rules regarding the development efforts of genetically modified organisms (GMOs). At the same time, the US thinks that GMOs are part of agriculture, so there is no need for any special laws to regulate them. Various side effects also come hand in hand with the birth of GMOs. They are ranging from adverse effects on human health, the health of food products, and even environmental damage. The development of GMOs can damage the ecosystem of species that exist in the environment. Still, more complex problems arise due to GMOs like economic problems and monopolies.

Keywords: The GMOs, The EU, The US

DOI: 10.33541/sp.v21i1.1589

Sociae Polites : Majalah Ilmiah Sosial Politik

Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Kristen Indonesia

ISSN 1410-3745 print/ ISSN 2620-4975 online

Volume 21, Number 1 (January – June 2020)

Pages 11-20

1. Introduction

Genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are organisms that have been altered using genetic engineering techniques. The presence of GMO crops plays an essential role in national food security. The presence of GMO food products or plants is not always beneficial. Some cases show GMO products causing adverse changes for the environment. The flow of genes from transgenic cultures to wild species has driven increasingly large and invasive and causes extinction in wild species.

Corporation promoted GMO crops to meet food consumption needs. The process of making GMOs can change the composition of the environment, and GMOs can become toxins. New genes can cause inflammation from those that increase the formation of existing toxins or that lead to the accumulation of new viruses. At present, the use of GMOs has expanded due to many advantages obtained in this product. GMOs undeniably has several advantages.

GMOs can be resistant to pests, resistant to various diseases, the use of fewer pesticides, have an attractive appearance, have more nutrients when compared to the original product, and so forth. The corporation claimed that GMOs would help the government to overcome the food crisis.

GMO products are very likely to affect human health and environmental issues. The results found that the use of GMOs can harm the environment and species. GMOs and other biotechnological applications have raised ecological and economic problems.

2. Literature Review

In giving food and feed product choices to consumers in the EU, it must contain 0.9% official GMOs and need to be labeled so that they can be tracked. But if the product comes from an animal that is fed GMO, it doesn't need to be labeled. The EU policy on GMOs began in 1999.

The US has also experienced modern agriculture since the mid-1990s with the introduction of GMOs. GMOs' creation combines DNA from other species in ways that are not the same as working with nature. The leading developer created a series of plants with genetic traits that made it resistant to glyphosate herbicides. Other types of GMO plants are also genetically converted into poisons for insects that eat plants. GMO soybeans and corn are the two most popular types of GMO crops grown by farmers. GMO crops are also widely used in the United States, dominating millions of hectares of US agricultural land and has also become popular in South America.

There is also concern that the widespread use of glyphosate herbicides in glyphosate-tolerant transgenic plants leaves pesticide residues in food that can interfere with human health that ingests food made from these plants. Many countries also prohibit the planting of GMO crops and must have strict requirements and labeling.

GMO regulations have created challenges for the EU's external environmental policy towards the US. The EU has strict rules on GMO policies. The EU also adopted standards for GMO approval, labeling, and planting, which have been developing since the 1990s. During the 1990s, various EU member states took GMO bans, but the EU also approved the planting of eighteen genetically modified varieties. Then in 1998, the EU decided to ban the commercial introduction of genetically modified new products and adopted regulations to label genetically modified foods and feeds and tracing GMOs at

all stages of their production and consumption chain in 2003 GMO policies have caused the transatlantic conflicts.

This fundamental difference between the European Union and the United States is the principle of the "Precautionary Principle." This principle emphasizes caution in accepting the new technology needed for technologies, which in terms of scientific understanding are unclear, and no agreement has yet found on the dangers or threats arising from these technologies. The European Union holds the form of the precautionary principle in terms of the entry of GMO products, namely in the way of product labeling. The desire of the European Union to label every GMO product is rejected by the United States, leading to differences in principles and ultimately leading to a rejection of the entry of GMO products into the European Union.

The United States considers that GMO products are the same agricultural products as other conventionally grown agrarian products. It is different from the European Union. In the United States, three departments deal with agricultural products. (1) The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) is responsible for protecting and securing crops and agriculture in the United States. (2) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is responsible for regulating the use of pesticides in genetically modified organism products. (3) The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is the department most responsible for making regulations of genetically modified organisms. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is the department most responsible for establishing rules from GMOs, which, according to FDA policy, GMO products, are not dangerous except for some instances, and no special provisions are needed.

This conflict occurred because the EU affirmed GMO's policy on environmental protection and human health, and the US considered this as protectionism. The European Union sees that the entry of GMO products is a form of threat that will endanger not only the health of consumers but also the environment so GMO products in the European Union must be limited. As a form of applying the precautionary principle held by the European Union, the European Union wants to label GMO products because consumers are entitled to get information about the food they consume. The United States and the European Union have different views on this issue. America is a country that looks at technology more in terms of output produced, while the European Union looks at the process of the production.

The United States also sees the implementation of the precautionary principle as an act of the European Union in reducing trade competition in agriculture in the European Union because the presence of GMOs from the United States will be a rival for local products in Europe. The creation of GMO products and then marketing them to various countries in the world poses a threat to local products in these destination countries. The entry of GMO products from the United States into the European Union will affect the value of local goods. Local goods tend to have a higher value than imported goods. Seeing from the existing economic principles, consumers will tend to choose goods with prices that are cheaper than goods that are more expensive but with almost the same quality or even the same. The EU feared that the GMOs would harm domestic farmers, which will indirectly turn off the European Union's local industry.

From a political perspective, the increase in the number of US exports to the European Union will further strengthen the position of the United States as a world superpower or hegemon. Surveys show that many American consumers like mandatory labeling of foods made with genetically modified ingredients. But many companies are blocking mandatory labeling, and this is very expensive and confusing consumer choices.

In 2016, President Barack Obama signed a law that carries the requirements for GMO labeling.

3. Results and Discussions

GMOs raise the pros and cons because the product has succeeded in contributing food to countries that lack food. The creation of GMOs as one of the food security efforts created by the United States for the world is certainly not readily accepted in various countries in the world, especially for states that have quite strict regulations on the entry of imported products such as those in the European Union. As a country producing GMO products, the United States has a different perspective on product creation when compared to the European Union, which maintains high standards of health and environmental protection.

In 2006, the final report issued by the WTO Dispute Resolution Panel concluded that policies made by the European Community in the form of a moratorium violated the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitation and Phytosanitary because it had caused unnecessary delays in imports. However, this was not justified by the European Communities because the moratorium was a policy related to procedures, and the nature of the regulation was temporary. Besides, the application of the *Precautionary Principle* is not an SPS rule. It has nothing to do with the regulations and competencies of the WTO. Still, it is more appropriate if it is associated with the Cartagena Protocol, which is a rule on environmental protection in the field of Biodiversity. The decision of the WTO Panel caused much debate regarding the competence of trade regulations and their relationship to the *Precautionary Principle* relating to environmental protection. With such an approach, the WTO has not been able to reach decisions that are relevant to policies outside of WTO arrangements.

In sum, this does not lead to significant practice changes. The European Union urges the inclusion of the precautionary principle in the Cartagena 2000 Protocol on Biosafety. Because the US is not part of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the US is not a full negotiating partner in the preparation of the Cartagena Protocol, which is under the auspices of the Convention. However, the US remains involved in negotiations to some extent by providing input through the Miami Group as GMO producers and exporters.

The Cartagena Protocol deals with transgenic movement across borders and establishes approval procedures based on advanced information for GMO imports into a country (Keilbach 2009, 120). It is only applied to parties to the Protocol and does not include the US. Biotechnical innovation will continue in the future, offering new opportunities for agriculture. Although all countries have the same goal of protecting the health and environment, regulations regarding the use of GMOs are very different. In short, the very different domestic approaches and international positions of the EU and the US have led to conflict.

4. GMO in Spain (Case Study)

Primary GM plants incorporate cotton, canola, corn, soy, and sugar beets whose qualities have changed to make them impervious to illness, bugs, or natural conditions, for example, dry spell. Starting in 2017, 24 nations over the world developed GMOs. In any case, just two countries in Europe have biotech crops spanning just 0.1 million

hectares, contrasted and 72.9 million in the USA. Without precedent for the historical backdrop of GMO reception in the EU, in 2017, only two nations planted hereditarily altered maize: Spain and Portugal. The slight decrease of GMO appropriation throughout the years in Europe is because of imperfect yield edges, and the EU-wide move to dispense with biotech fixings to maintain a strategic distance from to incorporate the expression "Contain GMOs" on the naming.

There is a legal system that has been set up by the European Union (EU) to guarantee all improvement of current biotechnology happens in safe conditions - including GMOs. It intends not just to ensure human and creature wellbeing, and the earth, yet additionally administers clear naming and recognizability of GMOs available. As a significant aspect of the system, GMO companies need to experience a necessary application process, where they solicitation to either develop or showcase nourishment or feed inside the EU.

These applications are comprising of a dossier with test information and hazard evaluation, which at that point, experiences an intricate and formal dynamic procedure. There is a further order which gives part expresses the option to forbid or confine the development of the harvest in their region for reasons, for example, natural or rural approach goals, or land use. So regardless of the yield is affirming at the EU level, the individual nation has the veto option the development of GMOs.

As of now, there is only one GMO developed in Spain – MON810 maize otherwise called Bt corn. It has been hereditarily altered to battle crop misfortune because of bugs and is endorsed for use far and wide from Argentina to Australia, and the US to Japan. It was supported by the European Union (EU) in 1998 and 2018 there were 115,000 hectares of MON810 in Spain, and the reception is constrained to zones where the objective vermin, European corn borer, unleashes devastation (Catalonia, Aragon, and Extremadura). Nonetheless, four locales in Spain have pronounced themselves sans GMO, which shows that help for GMOs isn't nationwide.

The EU imports generous measures of GM feed, for example, soybean and other vegetable proteins, to take care of its animals. It is original from nations where the development of GMOs is far-reaching, for example, Brazil, Argentina, and the USA. Nonetheless, the quantity of GM nourishments on racks in Europe is little. It has been a credit to worries over the wellbeing and natural dangers of GMOs, the accessibility of non-GM options, and the marking commitments of the legal system. The EU legal system orders GM is marking "on any GM nourishment and feed containing, comprising of, or delivered from a GMO, aside from if the nearness is beneath 0.9% of the nourishment/feed, or the fixing is unusual or unavoidable". The mark should express, "This item contains hereditarily changed living beings" or "This item contains [genetically adjusted name]." It is likewise essential that it's anything but a lawful necessity to mark a meat item where the creature may have benefited from a transgenic feed. Specialists have expressed that it would be difficult to implement that standard.

Common elements empowering the worldwide extension of GMOs incorporate overwhelming venture, fixed universal costs, and the growing job of transnational organizations. The GMO circumstance in Spain can't comprehend without first getting a handle on the EU's constitutional structure for their approval. Regardless of logical discoveries and expanding concerns and in incredible appear differently concerning France's position, Spain, as of now, has the most elevated reception pace of Bt maize in the EU since it was first presented in 1998. In 2012, more than 120 thousand hectares of Bt maize were develop — 19.5 percent more than the earlier year — speaking to 90

percent of GM crops in the EU. So for what reason donations that share a typical European lawful system, just as the comparative atmosphere and soil conditions, have oppositely contradicted sees on this issue? A study is direct for the European Commission in 2005 of every three of Spain's driving Bt maize-developing territories. While results do report better returns, the examination shows factual importance in just a single area, and all Bt maize created was sold for feed fabricating.

In 1998, the Spanish government approved two assortments of Bt maize 176 simply because, entrusting the biomonitoring procedure to similar organizations that had made those assortments. The difference in government in 2004, from conservative to progressively focus situated, made it feasible for the flights originating from traditional society to listen to, and a delegate from the ecological part concede in the National Commission on Biosafety.

The improvement of GMO sustenances in Europe happened all the while as the hidden steps toward a mix of national sanitation structures towards the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) were happening. It was politically aggressive because national bodies electorate were losing a part of their effect over the privately settled rule. For instance, Reinheitsgebot or Germany's blend flawlessness laws had practically ensured that anything set apart as the ale expected to have been making in Germany.

Distraught dairy animal illness in the UK was the most unmistakable of these occasions. Simultaneously, the radioactive contamination of European fields after Chernobyl drove Europeans to be particularly hesitant of awful logical choices made somewhere else. The Flavr Savr was the first monetarily grew innately assembled food to be permitted a license for human usage. The US biotechnology industry flaunted its way into this enough delicate regulatory Environment with GMO crops that they intended to offer to European farmers. They requested that Europeans simply recognize the security assessments that had just been made by a trio of US regulatory workplaces – the FDA, USDA, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The Europeans don't have of it.

At the same time, they, European scientists, were moving into GMOs. A canned and named GMO tomato had been successfully test-exhibited in the mid-1990s through a supportive comprehension between Sainsbury's, a critical UK essential food thing chain, and the University of Nottingham. The news talked about the US biotechnology industry's undertaking to oblige its way into European markets began to break, activists began campaigns against "Frankenfoods." Sainsbury's opponents started to advertise that their store brands were "without GMO," and Sainsbury dropped the assessment, saying, "our customers have shown to us evidence that they don't require innately changed fixings." Simultaneously, American fundamental food thing chains are overall not.

The commanding procedure has taken by the FDA against claims about rBST likely could be a contributing part to a legacy of American stores enduring the prosperity of GMO things. Additionally, as FDA has slackened up its undertakings to police ensures about the alleged clinical points of interest of sustenances, the American food industry has enabled signs of to pull in customers by touting the drawing in nature of characteristic or "sans GMO" food sources. The putative favorable circumstances of either are up 'til now not saw by US managerial associations.

It is intended to remain ready and firm more; the item neglected to address the issues of the US tomato industry. In any case, there is additionally ice-nucleating or "Frostban" microbes; StarLink corn; the Pusztai occurrence; African dismissal of US food help – the rundown proceeds.

Simultaneously, contemporary activists, who have presumably never known about Biotechnology's Bitter Harvest, are presently assembling consistently on the disappointment communicated a fourth of a century before making a monetarily and politically dynamic "food development." It needs nothing to do with biotechnology or hereditarily built nourishments. The EU Council sees the threats of GMOs as riskless to human prosperity yet rather more to the earth, alluding to the dangers of characterizing exceptional zones and non-GM crops. Spread through vertical and even quality trades, ruinous ramifications for non-focused on animals, and effects are maybe coming about in light of changes in plant rehearses.

The EU and the United States would profit by a productive discourse over marking approaches and harmonization. On the off chance that they proceed to differ and pick generally dissimilar systems, the effects on a universal rural exchange, just as on the biotechnology business, will be prompt and generous. Additionally, a continued with impasse around there finds a way to hinder the progression of new biotechnology things that offer necessary overall clinical preferences later on. Even though the WTO has not explicitly communicated how it would address a trade contradiction about naming as a non-obligation limit, such an inquiry would decidedly be extravagant for the two countries to the extent of resources and time.

An increasingly practical methodology would be for the two to start an exchange about naming choices, including negative marking, to build up a standard comprehension of the expected worldwide advantages and expenses related to various and orchestrated approaches. Notwithstanding, such a conversation must continue with due acknowledgment of the social contrasts in mentalities toward food and its job in public life and personality, and a thankfulness for the intense energy with which American science and industry approach innovative change.

Germany presented the objective of conjunction between GM, non-GM, and natural plantings in 2005, consistent with the normal market direction of Directive 18/2001. Simultaneously, Germany changed the meaning of a GMO to ensure against ecological contamination through GM plants. From that point forward, the German Act has characterized a GMO not just as a life form whose hereditary material is adjusting in a manner that doesn't normally happen by mating or common recombination. It additionally one that has come presence through mating or common recombination between a GMO and a non-GM life form. As needs are, plants that were unintentionally reproducing through recombination with GMOs likewise fall under the limitations of the Genetic Engineering Act, for example, requiring a grant to be advertised or discharged. Decisions in German legal disputes dependent on this extended definition have prompted the devastation of many polluted plantings.

The German government has proposed to see on a case-by-case base whether those novel breeding methods cause GMOs and must be labeled. Green party gene-splicing spokesman Harald Ebner demanded more transparency. The EU rules on GMOs clearly define a GMO as a process- but not product-related. Consumers must have the choice, Ebner told European Biotechnology. He accused the government's legal proposal to support industry interests to hunt out a backdoor to bring GMOs to the table. Along with the latest Eurobarometer polls, currently, there isn't any marketplace for GM food in Europe. The proportion of Europeans hostile GM food is 58%.

If not, they argue, there's no difference to so-called natural products, that's highly optimized breeds using conventional breeding techniques. Internationally, regulations

concerning methods like oligonucleotide-directed mutagenesis or gene knock-out be genome editing are heterogeneous.

The investigation's fundamental decisions are: The utilization of the preparatory guideline isn't gotten ready for CETA and not got prepared for TTIP. In the EU, government officials pick the endorsement of hereditarily adjusted plants before they're at any point set available.

In North America, the specialists, alone, are blameworthy for both of these means. State Secretary Flachsbarth positively excused worries over purchaser insurance. No settling for the status quo, kind of conditioning of GMO guideline, are acknowledged through TTIP. The European Parliament got an opportunity at official, clear, and EU-wide standards for the endorsement of hereditarily altered plants. In the interim, most of the populace has communicated clear resistance to biotechnology.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are a portion of the world's most disputable innovations. Transoceanic debates emerging in relative to the strict administrative contrasts amongst the two significant structures — those of the United States and the European Union — have influenced science, speculation, and seeding choices around the world. This critical contrast amongst the European Union and the United States is the guideline of the "Prudent Principle" held by the European Union. This rule underscores alert in tolerating the innovation required for advances, which, as far as logical comprehension is indistinct and no understanding, has yet to be found on the risks or dangers emerging from these advances. The type of the preparatory is a guideline by the European Union as far as the passage of GMO items, to be specific as an item marking. The craving of the European Union to mark each GMO item is dismissed by the United States, prompting contrasts in standards and at last prompting a dismissal of the section of GMO items into the European Union.

Work is presently ongoing to form plant-determined vaccination applicants in potatoes and lettuce for Norwalk Infection, Enterotoxigenic Escherichia coli (ETEC), and hepatitis B infection (HBV). Scientists are also studying the form of different significant proteins in various plants. Generally, modified organisms already used to elevate transplant tissues and human transplant organs. Many peoples additionally worry about possible risks.

Other than the specialized complexities of concluding to manage the development and utilization of GMOs, there are not kidding inquiries regarding control of the administrative procedure. The ongoing BSE involvement with the UK outlines how the administration of guidelines intended to ensure buyers, without much of a stretch, clash with the compulsion to secure the controlled business. This sort of 'administrative catch' is a typical event as contending intrigues fight for control of the administrative procedure.

On account of GMOs, there is significant weight from the multinationals to streamline the administrative procedure. Then again, those asking a progressively mindful methodology may incorporate ecological activists as well as business agrarian interests that could lose from rivalry with the development or importation of GMOs.

In rundown, the guideline of something as mind-boggling as GMOs should never be possible on a simple objective, specialized premise. The appraisal of hazard and the translation of information will consistently be influence by the estimations of the controllers and the political and financial weights applied to the administrative procedure.

Be that as it may, progress towards progressively proper guidelines of GMOs can be made with access to adequate specialized and natural information and regulatory strategies that are as straightforward as could reasonably be expected.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aalberse, R. C. (2005). Assessment of sequence homology and cross-reactivity. *Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology*, 207(2 Suppl), 149–151.
- Adelle, C., Biedenkopf, K., & Torney, D. (Eds.). (2017). *European Union \ External Environmental Policy: Rules, Regulation, and Governance Beyond Borders*. Springer.
- Amallina, I. F. (2012). *Faktor-faktor Penolakan Uni Eropa Terhadap Produk-produk Genetically Modified Food dan Genetically Modified Organism dari Amerika Serikat* (Doctoral Dissertation, Universitas Airlangga).
- Dawson, V. & Venville, G.J. (2009). High School Student's Informal Reasoning and Argumentation about Biotechnology: An Indicator of Science Literacy?. *International Journal of Science Education*, 31 (11) pp.1421-1445
- James, C., 2010. *Global Status of Commercialized Biotech/GM Crops: 2010*. ISAAA Brief 42. ISAAA: Ithaca, New York.
- Kalaitzandonakes, N., J. Alston, and K. Bradford, 2007. Compliance costs for regulatory approval of new biotech crops. *Nature Biotechnology* 25:509-511.
- Kalaitzandonakes N. and J. Bijman, 2003. So Who's Driving Biotech Acceptance? *Nature Biotechnology*, 21: 336-39.