CellPress

Letter

The Need to Understand GMO Opposition: Reply to Couée

Stefaan Blancke,[1,*] Frank Van Breusegem,[2,3] Geert De Jaeger,[2,3] Johan Braeckman,[1] and Marc Van Montagu[2,3,4]

Ivan Couée [1] suggests that our article 'Fatal attraction: the intuitive appeal of GMO opposition' [2] defines the societal debates about biotechnology as 'a battlefield between rationality and irrationality'. Instead, he proposes 'a framework of mutual respect and interest between citizens and scientists'. However, we believe that this is a false dilemma. While we endorse his plea for mutual understanding, we think that comprehending how concerns and beliefs about GMOs arise from untrustworthy sources facilitates, rather than impedes, the development of a conciliatory framework. In our experience, when scientists learn about the intuitive and emotive basis of public concerns, they do not put them aside as irrational. On the contrary, they tend to take a more lenient attitude towards GMO opposition, simply because they now better understand where it stems from and why it exists. Moreover, understanding GMO opposition induces scientists to consider the role and the impact of science on society at large, and to think about ways to improve the communication and relationship with the public. On the side of the public, the realization that some of their ideas are illusory prompts lay people to reconsider their stance towards GMOs.

Couée acknowledges the need to understand why people oppose GMOs. Indeed, he renders his own account, arguing that in the wake of earlier cases, people are understandably skeptical about the introduction of new biotechnologies. This rationale leads Couée to describe the opposition as a case of empirical rationality. We welcome his attempt to account for GMO opposition, which certainly has merit. We can indeed imagine that earlier cases have made citizens more cautious towards biotechnology. However, Couée's explanation for why people oppose GMOs does not make the opposition any more rational than our account in terms of human cognition. In the end, opposing GMOs in general remains unreasonable in light of the scientific evidence. This includes evidence pertaining complex societal issues, about which lay people err as much as about facts concerning the technology. Moreover, Couée's approach fails to account for the typical features of the GM opposition and why the focus lies on GMOs and not on other technologies. As such, an analysis in terms of intuitions and emotions makes an essential contribution to the understanding of GMO opposition.

[1]Department of Philosophy and Moral Sciences, Ghent University, 9000, Ghent, Belgium
[2]Department of Plant Systems Biology, VIB, 9052, Ghent, Belgium
[3]Department of Plant Biotechnology and Bioinformatics, Ghent University, 9052, Ghent, Belgium
[4]Institute of Plant Biotechnology Outreach–VIB, Incubation and Innovation Center, Ghent University, 9052 Ghent, Belgium

*Correspondence: st.blancke@gmail.com (S. Blancke).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2015.12.001

References
1. Couée, Y. (2016) Hidden attraction: empirical rationality of GMO opposition. *Trends Plant Sci.* 21, 91
2. Blancke, S. *et al.* (2015) Fatal attraction: the intuitive appeal of GMO opposition. *Trends Plant Sci.* 20, 414–418

Forum

The Future of Field Trials in Europe: Establishing a Network Beyond Boundaries

Hartmut Stützel,[1,*] Nicolas Brüggemann,[2] and Dirk Inzé[3,4]

We propose the establishment of a European Consortium for Open Field Experimentation (ECOFE) that will allow easy access of European plant and soil scientists to experimental field stations that cover all major climatological regions. Coordination and quality control of data extraction and management systems will greatly impact on our ability to cope with grand challenges such as climate change and food security.

Technical and social infrastructures are the backbones of modern societies, enabling vital amenities such as supply and disposal of products, financial transactions, education, art, social security, and health services. Without such infrastructures, trade, travel, and technological and social progress would be almost impossible. Because they are so essential, it is commonly accepted that infrastructures are a public responsibility, in other words they are developed and maintained by the state.

Because infrastructures for scientific research are equally important for the advancement of science and technologies, governments are also assumed to be responsible for experimental and explorative infrastructures with high financial requirements, such as particle accelerators (CERN[i]), centres for space exploration, etc. For example, the Federal Government of Germany finances, among others, 20% of the CERN budget[ii] and research vessels for marine research[iii]. Similar endeavors with government support are the French national synchrotron facility SOLEIL[iv], its Italian equivalent Elettra[v], and the Dutch Foundation for Fundamental Research on Matter (FOM[vi]). The British Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC[vii]) operates large-scale facilities including the Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, the Daresbury Laboratory, the Chilbolton Observatory, and the UK Astronomy Technology Centre. Common to these infrastructures is that they are too expensive for a single university or research institute, and that they can be used most efficiently by a cross-institutional and multidisciplinary research community. A recent example of a European environmental monitoring network is the Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS[viii]) which is now part of the strategic European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures (ESFRI) Roadmap. We feel that similar support for translational plant sciences is needed.

Field trial sites, such as experimental stations or experimental fields, are essential research infrastructures for environmentally oriented agricultural sciences including agronomy, plant breeding, crop protection, agro-ecology, and soil science. The aim is to study the interactions between cropping systems and the environment, and to learn about the performance of genetic material in natural environments. At these test sites, research questions are investigated at the level of the plot (e.g., process studies), field (e.g., productivity), farm (e.g., crop rotations) or even landscape (e.g., matter fluxes, ecosystem services). Usually these field trial sites are run by individual, national research institutions. They require substantial investments, are expensive to operate, and their purpose is therefore often questioned by financial evaluators/auditors. As a result, several agricultural experimental stations have been closed down in recent years. Well-known examples are the Long Ashton Research station, closed in 2003[ix], and the University of Bonn field research station Dikopshof, which was closed in 2009 after more than 100 years of activity[x].

A closer look at the research topics investigated at field trial sites demonstrates their irreplaceability: questions related to crop productivity and quality [1], climate change effects on crops [2,3], nutrient fluxes in agro-ecosystems, resource efficiency, stress mitigation [4], or the properties of resilient cropping systems cannot be investigated in test tubes in the laboratory. Usually they imply the interactions between genotype (G), environment (E), and management (M), in short: the $G \times E \times M$ interactions [5]. Inevitably, the investigation of $G \times E \times M$ interactions requires, in addition to genotypic variation, ranges of environmental factors or gradients, and variation in agronomic management. In view of a growing world population, global climate change, and increasing strictness of environmental policies, we can expect that the above-mentioned themes will gain importance in agricultural and plant research, and it is imperative to investigate whether we have the appropriate infrastructure to meet these challenges. We may reasonably assume that a deeper understanding of the effects of plant traits and production intensity on ecological processes is a necessary prerequisite for designing cropping systems that meet the demands of our society for high productivity and sustainability at the same time. As a consequence, future research in plant and agro-ecological science will increasingly depend on large-scale and long-term data obtained from scientific experiments under real-world conditions.

Individual universities and even some of the larger governmental research institutes do not have the resources to set up and maintain a set of field trial sites that would cover the relevant range of natural conditions and allow state-of-the-art monitoring and experimental variation of environmental factors including temperature, CO_2, and water. Such an infrastructure can realistically only be organized as a network. This network should comprise large parts of the relevant science community and should not stop at national borders because research problems are also not defined by such borders. Similarly to particle accelerators and research vessels, this field experimental network should be considered as a genuine governmental or, in a European context, inter-governmental task.

Such a network of field trial sites, provided with long-term funding, would give the research community the necessary administrative and financial security for long-term activities. Moreover, a network structure would allow coordinated development of the individual sites, ensuring the necessary specialization and optimal resource allocation. For example, selected sites could be equipped with technology for rain control and irrigation, some stations could operate CO_2-enrichment facilities, and others could be equipped with the safety structures necessary for work with genetically modified plants. Phenotyping platforms could be installed and even protected sites for field research on genetically modified crop plants could be part of the network. Researchers would be able to conduct their experiments at the locations most suitable for their research questions and could choose, for example, relevant gradients of soil and climatic variables. As a consequence, such a network would provide much better services than currently available and use resources more efficiently than individual field stations allocated to individual research institutions. In a network, keeping technical equipment up to date would be easier and methodological standards and