

British Company Oxitec's Proposal to Release Genetically Modified Mosquitoes in the US

By <u>Heather Callaghan</u> Global Research, December 11, 2014 <u>Activist Post</u> 10 December 2014 Region: <u>USA</u> Theme: <u>Biotechnology and GMO</u>

Last Thursday, a town hall meeting at Harvey Government Center in Key West <u>drew a large</u> <u>crowd</u> that erupted in opposition to a proposal to release genetically modified mosquitoes this coming Spring. It's a proposal from a seemingly strange choice – the United Kingdom.

British company <u>Oxitec</u> is petitioning the U.S. Government for permission to release male GE *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes that contain a gene whereby they die unless receiving an antidote in the form of antibiotic tetracycline. The males released will live long enough to mate, but the offspring will die before maturation. The proposal that is now gaining ground has been in preparation for three years, with significant involvement by <u>Wellcome Trust</u>. In 2012, the plan to go through was thwarted when a resolution didn't pass.

Of course the company insists that the technology is totally safe.

The expressed idea behind using Key Haven for the trial run is to eradicate the possibility of dengue and chikungunya viruses – yet, the area hasn't experienced dengue since 2010. The FDA, CDC, USDA, and EPA are in tandem reviewing the process.

Among the most vocal opponents is Mila de Mier, whose <u>massive petition</u> caught a lot of attention.

She says:

There are lots of questions that need to be answered. This is bigger than a couple people raising objections; the government is trying to do an experiment with the people of Florida.

Residents have listed several concerns:

- The Aedes aegypti mosquito is not native to the Keys.
- Future resistance problems when certain mosquitoes don't actually die off [and what problems would that pose for potential disease too]?
- The mosquitoes' effect on the bat population that feeds on them.
- Where are the peer-reviewed safety studies to support Oxitec's safety claims?
- Could other disease-carrying mosquitoes fill in the void left by a dwindled Aedes aegypti population?

Yahoo News adds the following:

Critics also contend that Oxitec cannot completely sort mutated insects by gender, resulting in the release of biting females into the environment (male mosquitoes do not bite humans).

Oxitec spokesperson Chris Creese said it was possible some females could get released but being bitten by one was no different than being bitten by a wild female....

She said of the five different dengue viruses/subtypes:

They are all transmitted by this species of mosquito – So yes, it is clear the virus will mutate. But if you can stop the mosquito, you can stop the disease.

[...]

The safety of the GM mosquitoes has been reviewed by regulatory agencies in Brazil, Malaysia, Cayman and Panama...and none of the agencies determined any [increased] risk to human health or the environment.

All the unanswered or non-reassuring answers to the questions lead to a fear that even scientists have of a major ecological disruption. Even the company cannot answer concerns with complete certainty.

Creese, who did not mention where previous trials in the wild took place or how they were certain the mosquitoes don't affect the bat population, added that in the lab up to five percent of the GE male population *can* survive,

However in the open environment one has harsher conditions and we don't see that level of survival. We haven't seen any survivors after a couple of weeks.

But a big question remains unanswered – why now? Why the urgency? Why did the wheels for this trial project keep turning after dengue disappeared from the Keys? Why is Oxitec (and Wellcome)<u>so willing</u> to generously finance the entire operation?

I think a look at the people behind the company <u>is revealing</u>. Syngenta, Bayer, biotech and pharma alums top the list.

A final comment from the Oxitec spokesperson who pointed out to dengue outbreaks in the Caribbean Islands as a reason for prompt release.

The situation is, can we afford to do nothing? Prevention is the best defense.

In other words, this is a vastly uncharted and extreme preemptive move – where no threat currently exists. Where no other options have been placed on the table for future possibilities. Where no benefits exist except for a trial run to test their work on insects, a human population and the ecosystem.

<u>Heather Callaghan</u> is a natural health blogger and food freedom activist. You can see her work at <u>NaturalBlaze.com</u> and <u>ActivistPost.com</u>. Like at <u>Facebook</u>.

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Heather Callaghan

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

<u>www.globalresearch.ca</u> contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca