

AKTgGmbH Peter H. Arras • Kindenheimer Str.2 • 67308 Biedesheim

- Dem Leben unsere Stimme leihen -

To the EU- Commissioner of Agriculture
Mr. Dacian CIOLOS - personally -
European Commission / Commission Europeenne

B-1049 BRUSSELS

Biedesheim/ Germany, 07/30/2010

Subject: In the wake of the CAP after 2013 – Conference

Dear Agriculture Commissioner Ciolos,

First I'd like to thank you very much, that you accepted our paper at the end of the Conference last Tuesday in person, and that a short conversation was possible – despite the pressure of time.

Were you able to read the documents in the meantime?

Allow me please to address you once more under the impression of this great conference and the after-effects of your final speech. I'd like to express as supplement to my drawing a few more thoughts.



1) As a result from the speeches of the Conference, 70% of the agricultural products are processed by the food and beverage industry. This means that only **30% of the agricultural products are**

Der AKT- Gründer wurde 2002 von der **Hans-Rönn-Stiftung „Menschen für Tiere“** für seine Verdienste im Tierschutz und für seine Mitweltethik mit einem Preis geehrt.

Nach 15 Jahren in Karlsruhe hat die **AKTgGmbH** ihren Sitz im Juli 2004 nach Biedesheim verlegt, wo sie eine hochmoderne Tierhaltung und u.a. eine **Tropenhalle für Exoten und Reptilien** betreibt.

Im Mai 2009 verlieh der Landkreis Donnersberg den **„Donnersberger Tierschutzpreis“** an die AKT gGmbH.

consumed in pure form by the citizens of Europe. 70% are processed, pureed, emulsified, decomposed into components and thus denatured or as part of food design processed into something that has to do only very little with its naturally grown original form. This is exactly what I expressed to you in my paper which I handed personally to you. We therefore take the view that the starting material of the food industry could easily have come also from bioreactor systems

2) Subject of abandonment of land and lack of young farmers.

I could see how important these two factors have been, for the most conference participants and also for you. For this part I would say in addition: The bioreactor technology favoured by me is an up-to-date and thus a modern form of efficient nutrient production, which in addition to the environmental and economic benefits, corresponds to the attitudes and lifestyles of young people in the agricultural and food production.

The present form of agriculture demands that the people working in it have a seven-day week, heavy physical work and mostly late evenings. For this reason, male farmer have difficulties to find partners. Our recommended method of food production would change the situation fundamentally. The bioreactors are automatic and computer controlled, can be served and supplied during regular working hours. The grass required for cellulose production should not be mowed and taken care of at weekends. This new technology would require the withdrawal of food microbiologists and engineers in the agricultural sector. The farmers of the future would mostly be professionals and technicians, which would make the profession more attractive to young people because it means a new challenge. A broad social acceptance of such demanding work would interest more young people for this form of agriculture.

3) Many rural areas in Europe are structurally weak, underdeveloped, and therefore unattractive as a place to live and work for most of people. The technology recommended by us should be installed for logistical reasons where the raw material is growing and will be mowed -in the country. It is obvious that this new industry, of course, would create new jobs, especially when you consider that the processing industry would locate in the area . Please note that other diverse sectors would also benefit from this new industry, among others the construction industry, the metal and electronic industry (for example, Biofermentertanks), supply, maintenance and assembly plants etc.

4) In your final speech, you noted that you support the permanent disposal of CO2 in deep soil layers. Here I would like to give to consider the following: CO2 is a valuable plant nutrient that is breathed in the course of photosynthesis, and is converted to oxygen. Why should we dispose of CO2, rather than convert it using Phytoreaktors in combination with sunlight into sugar and starch? Unicellular algae, which convert an annoying, because climate-damaging waste product of our energy into what it has been in the first place, namely carbon in the form of valuable nutrients that we need so much.

5) Only the bioreactor technology gives us full control of the metabolic processes involved in the production of nutrients. What goes into the tank, and what emerges as a product and metabolic end product is to 100% subject of our decision. The problem of conventional nutrient production resides precisely in the fact that there are so many by-products, we call this emissions. (Manure, methane, CO2, fertilizer, which enter the groundwater, pesticides, etc.).

6) Internet research on our part have shown that the United States, Canada and China are already working to develop the Biofermentertechnology-but so far only partially for the production of nutrients. The German chemical company BASF, for example microbiologically produces proteins in order to use them as part of cleaning agents. In the Netherlands, too, projects run, but those are related primarily to fuels and biochemicals. Especially fungi are attested great potential regarding effective nutrient production. On the CAP Conference it was also discussed that the EU regards itself a pioneer of modern agriculture and food production in the world. Do we want to allow other nations / federations to overtake us in this?

7) It was also mentioned that every citizen had the right to continuously available food, and that the CAP would ensure this. At the same time Mr. Kostas Stamoulis of the United Nations (FAO) clarified in his speech on July 19, that it was not known, in which way in a few decades the growing world population was to be fed and that the resources needed are not available in our biosphere. Professor Marc Dufumier, France, had also expressed in a similar manner, the importance of plant proteins and called for a global, common agricultural policy. **It should in my view be avoided under all circumstances to allow multinational corporations in the pharmaceutical and chemical industries to patent the nutrient production via high-tech and thus take the monopoly here,** while the government could be blackmailed. Who owns the raw materials and nutrients, exercises power on our planet. That's why we consider it **urgent that the EU already now creates research projects and facilities as quickly as possible, thus taking a leading role in the world with regard to those increasingly acute problems with effective solutions.**

8) Several speakers and participants of the CAP claimed persistently that farmland used for agriculture in former times which was now deserted, became desolate and it was also repeatedly stressed that a comprehensive cultivation was necessary, which resulted from the Treaty of Rome. It was not desirable and not possible to leave the country almost natural. I had protested in Workshop No.3 against this, and now also want to emphasize to you that the environment -in spite of Chernobyl radioactive exposure, clearly shows **how successful and quickly, nature turns back formerly man-used and populated area in a few decades into original wilderness,** which is also intensively studied and observed by several research projects on the ground.

We don't understand, from which the assertion is derived empirically **that nature needs the farmer as a kind of gardener and manager to be and stay intact.** We think this is a very anthropocentric fallacy that can't be justified by anything. The farmer is a factor which undermines natural processes by technical means of mechanical and chemical nature. How quickly nature reappears and corrects ecological imbalances, once man retires or ceases its manipulative arbitrariness can be seen everywhere. When restoring the natural balance is really part of the agenda of the EU agricultural policy (regeneration of biodiversity, groundwater, and decontamination of soils and waters etc.), then this is only possible **if we permanently return agricultural land to nature.**



When you look at Europe from the plane, you would suspect that the planet had a skin disease-almost every corner of the country (including commercial forests) are used up by the people, processes of natural balance are inhibited here permanently. How should biodiversity be possible in such a culture steppe? What would be required today, would be evenly distributed protected areas, which are connected together to prevent inbreeding and allow animals to evade. What would you think if in a

few decades Africa would look like Europe, when former savannas and woodlands were so rigorously converted to agricultural land? In emerging markets, this is already practiced in a fatal way- think only of Brazil. Europe, too, was once a vast pasture forest, much like the rain forests. With the Biofermentertechnology we would due to its efficiency, no longer need large areas of land for agriculture and could return them to nature.

9) The Biofermentertechnology pointed out by us, known by experts as 'white biotechnology', poses a win-win solution in itself (not just for farmers, consumers and society), really all of the parties involved, including non-human creatures and the whole living world which surrounds us and we are part of. In particular, the unethical meat production would be superfluous at last-together with all health and environmental disadvantages associated for the people.

Dear Commissioner Ciolos,

not only in your image film, but also in your statements you repeatedly expressed nostalgic thoughts and ideals which reflect the importance of agriculture and its multiple functions in and for society. If you rated agriculture from the perspective of nature, then you would come to an entirely different result. Of course, agriculture goes back **to a 9000-year-old tradition**, of course, the ingestion of food is culturally coded and archaic, and **of course there will also in the future regionally produced natural foods on our markets**. I never said that people should only feed on Biofermenter nutrients, although I am convinced that this will be so in the distant future.

It's all about saving our planet and its biosphere here and today and to secure a decent future of our species.

While in the first world people are poking vain in artfully arranged gourmet food, people are starving miserably in other parts of the world and our environment is more and more ruined. We have no time for nostalgic reveries, especially since modern agriculture has nothing more to do with romanticism, tradition and love of nature for a long time! Of course, the CAP conference and its previous surveys served to collect the majority will of the people, in order to enable you to derive a consensus policy. But remember that even our grandfathers, who have been farmer (my grandfather was a wine-grower and fattened pigs), not dared to dream that technological developments would emerge in agriculture in the shortest time.

Sometimes politics must make a decision, which the citizens and voters can not catch yet, just as they sometimes can not judge what has to happen today in order to make progress so that they and their descendants are able to survive tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. The **gifted as responsible and future-oriented politician is known by his courage progressing to where others from selfish and opportunistic motivation hold to the old ways, despite all reason**.

The fact that people apparently want to hold on to tried and tested practices, as long as there is some way, goes back to evolutionary biological and behavioral causes. But the point is that we humans carry out, despite our intelligence, mostly later course corrections, as this would be really appropriate, so we have to fear today, the consequences of climate change, although 30 years ago first scientists warned us exactly against those man-made developments. Please remember that you would have been told to leave the room 30 years ago, if you had made a speech talking about biodiversity, environmental protection, animal welfare and climate.

And now I am the one who fears, unfortunately, that you will dismiss my important concerns, just because they are new. So I ask you and all the responsible people **to consider my proposal unbiased and as objective as possible - you will recognize beyond doubt that my argument is correct and my proposal is long overdue**.

I'm planning a new promotional film for the EU-Commission of Agriculture:

It begins in black and white and shows depressing impressions of fattening units in which sensitive organisms are crowded into a confined space in their own filth and scenes during loading, transport and slaughter. It shows further sequences of application of manure on land, chemical fertilizers and pesticides and monocultures on raped country tormented by giant tractors, eroded land and contaminated waters.

Then the film is colored, and a young man in a white coat walks in a hall in front of his clean- glittering high-grade steel biofermenterbatteries. In a calm way he controls his gauges on a laptop, looking through a porthole, in which cheerfully floating microbes can be seen.

He smiles and says, "My grandfather did not have a white coat, in the evening he smelled of manure had to perform seven days a week hard work for his products and got a few cents. He fattened pigs and bulls and tilled the land with violent machinery and a lot of poison". The young man goes outside where in a natural setting up to the horizon colorful flowering meadows lie in the sun. The camera zooms in on a flower, a butterfly drinks nectar. The young nutrient producer next: "And here our raw material is growing, food for our tiny living organisms that provide us with clean and healthy nutrients - cellulose!"

Final slogan: 'Your European Union has solved the world food problem and showed that man and his environment are compatible, thanks to modern bioreactor technology'.

I urge you, to consider seriously our proposal to which you indeed invited us and to carry out the necessary steps promptly and vigorously in order to serve the whole world which in its importance can not be overestimated . Please use your entire political influence by bringing this elementary initiative on its way - generations of people will thank you for it worldwide.

Get Europe biophile supremacy and thereby set a clear sign of responsible, holistic and future oriented politics.

On the website of Eurobio, an EU institution, the Triple P-factor is presented, resulting from industrial biotechnology - namely the benefits of White Biotechnology in economy, society and environment, even if –for some obscure reason-it is not clear to us why it doesn't come to nutrient production.

Before we spread our vision into wider circles of politics, the media and society, we want to wait for your opinion, which we wish to ask you promptly.

Because time is short!

Thank you in advance for your efforts, we remain for the time being,

Yours sincerely

INSTITUT FÜR MITWELTETHIK (Institute for all- comprising- ethics)

An Institution of
AKT- AKTION KONSEQUENTER TIERSCHUTZ
gemeinnützige Gesellschaft mbH

Peter H. Arras
Founder and Manager

(Translated by Dorothee Munzinger)