

Seconde, DNL, How to feed the world debate : **shall we ban glyphosate ?**

Debate 1: "Shall we ban the glyphosate?"

Sources, available on **dnlrenoir.fr** too.

Videos

France 24 video about glyphosate

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GmREhq3G3iQ>

Monsanto's video about Glyphosate

https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=78&v=Ek7p5r6UNJU

Vidéo de Euronews sur l'autorisation du Glyphosate

<https://www.euronews.com/2016/06/30/the-european-battle-over-the-herbicide-known-as-glyphosate>

Vidéo de TRT news (chaîne turque)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HtnlHkok7xQ>

Articles

Bayer sued in the US for selling Glyphosate

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-bayer-glyphosate-lawsuits/bayers-monsanto-faces-8000-lawsuits-on-glyphosate-idUSKCN1L81J0>

Monsanto ordered to pay \$289 million in world's first Roundup cancer trial

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-monsanto-cancer-lawsuit/monsanto-ordered-to-pay-289-million-in-worlds-first-roundup-cancer-trial-idUSKBN1KV2HB>

Germany + 13 Other Countries Say No to Glyphosate: What About the U.S.?

<https://www.organicconsumers.org/news/germany-13-other-countries-say-no-glyphosate-what-about-us>

Glyphosate, 1 million signatures are needed to ban it in Europe

<https://www.lifegate.com/people/news/glyphosate-european-citizens-initiative-eci>

Ban on glyphosate would be 'disaster' for Brazil agriculture: minister

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-brazil-agriculture-chemicals/ban-on-glyphosate-would-be-disaster-for-brazil-agriculture-minister-idUSKBN1L11Y7>

Is banning glyphosate the right move?

<https://global.handelsblatt.com/politics/is-banning-glyphosate-the-right-move-835727>

THE GLYPHOSATE BAN: A CAUTIONARY TALE FOR THE U.S.

<https://dailycaller.com/2017/10/27/the-glyphosate-ban-a-cautionary-tale-for-the-u-s/>

Seconde, DNL, How to feed the world debate : **shall we ban glyphosate ?**

Ban on glyphosate would be 'disaster' for Brazil agriculture: minister

Rodrigo Viga Gaier, Ana Mano

RIO DE JANEIRO/SAO PAULO (Reuters) - A potential ban on the popular herbicide glyphosate in Brazil over concerns it may cause cancer in humans would be a "disaster" for the country's agricultural industry, Agriculture Minister Blairo Maggi said on Thursday.

A Brazilian court ruled on Aug. 3 that new products containing the chemical could not be registered in the country and existing registrations would be suspended starting from September, until health authority Anvisa issues a decision on its re-evaluation of glyphosate's safety.

Maggi said that glyphosate is used on around 95 percent of soy, corn and cotton harvested in the country and that there is no readily available substitute. Brazil is the world's top exporter of soy and a major producer and exporter of corn.

"Glyphosate makes it viable for us to plant and grow crops. What is the alternative?" Maggi said at an event in Rio de Janeiro.

Brazil's Solicitor General's office has said it is preparing an appeal to the court decision with the Agriculture Ministry's backing. Maggi said he is confident the ruling will be overturned on appeal.

The Brazilian court case is part of a global pushback against the chemical. A U.S. judge ruled last week that Monsanto must pay \$289 million in damages to a man who alleged its glyphosate-based products like Roundup caused his cancer.

Monsanto, taken over earlier this year by Bayer AG, said in a statement that more than 800 reviews, including those by the U.S. environmental and health authorities, support that glyphosate does not cause cancer. The company is appealing the U.S. court ruling.

Brazil federal prosecutors brought the case to force Anvisa to make a decision in its re-evaluation of glyphosate, which it started in 2008, said Marco Antonio Delfino de Almeida, a member of a prosecutors' working group on pesticides.

A 2015 assessment by the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer determined glyphosate probably causes cancer in humans, which provides a basis for reconsidering its safety, Almeida said.

If the Brazil ban on existing product registrations goes into effect, it could disrupt farmers who are set to begin planting soy in September.

The sale of glyphosate products would be halted and farmers who use products with suspended registrations could face legal risks, said Brazil-based agribusiness lawyer Frederico Favacho.

Anvisa told Reuters it is prioritizing its re-evaluation of glyphosate but did not give a timeframe for announcing its findings.

Reporting by Rodrigo Viga Gaier and Ana Mano; Writing and additional reporting by Jake Spring; Editing by Frances Kerry and Lisa Shumaker

Is banning glyphosate the right move?

Outlawing the herbicide in the EU would have little impact on a merged Bayer/Monsanto but the agrochemicals industry fears it could be just the tip of the regulatory iceberg.

Bert-Friedrich Fröndhoff Bert-Friedrich Fröndhoff Silke Kersting Silke Kersting October 5, 2017 3:09 pm

Farmers have been spraying the weedkiller glyphosate on their fields for decades. It's cheap and effective – German railway Deutsche Bahn, for example, uses 75 metric tonnes (82.7 tons) per year to keep weeds off its tracks. But it has been dogged by persistent fears that it may cause cancer, and the EU looks likely to refuse to renew its license when it expires at the end of this year.

A new round of EU talks on re-authorizing glyphosate will start today, with farming industry bodies across Europe up in arms at the increasingly real prospect that it may be banned in a few months. "I fear that there won't be a clear majority for a new license in the upcoming vote by EU member states," said Peter Liese, a member of the European Parliament's environment committee. Worse for the industry, insiders fear a move against glyphosate may just be the start of something bigger, with politicians training their sights on other agro-chemicals out of political, rather than scientific, grounds.

Though no decision is expected today, France has already made clear it opposes glyphosate. Austria will only give its blessing under strict new conditions. And Germany is on the fence – Berlin's outgoing government abstained in previous votes because it was divided. The agriculture ministry, run by the conservative Christian Social Union, was in favor while the environment ministry, led by the center-left Social Democrats, was opposed.

And Germany will likely have to keep on abstaining in the wake of the September 24, general election because the most likely new coalition, an alliance among conservatives, environmentalists Greens and pro-business Free Democrats, probably won't agree on a common position. Without Germany, there won't be a qualified EU majority for a new license.

Meanwhile, the public row over glyphosate is intensifying. The weedkiller, launched in 1973 by US agrochemicals group Monsanto, has become a front line between NGOs and industry. Greenpeace and other environmental groups want it outlawed because they don't believe the cancer fears have been disproved and point to a verdict by the World Health Organization that it's "probably carcinogenic."

But the chemical industry doesn't agree. "Glyphosate is one of the best-researched chemicals," said Kurt Bock, CEO of German chemicals giant BASF, who is also the president of the VCI German chemical industry association. No study has proven the weedkiller is unsafe, he said, while others have pointed out that the WHO list of carcinogenic substances also includes red meat, even though this may only be true at very high levels of consumption.

The German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR) has undertaken fresh research into glyphosate on behalf of the EU and concluded that if used properly, there's no discernible cancer risk for humans. The European Food Safety Authority concurred with that assessment. But environmental groups have questioned the reliability of the new report, accusing the BfR of copying a study by glyphosate inventor Monsanto. The general public meanwhile doesn't know what to believe.

A ban on glyphosate in Europe wouldn't have a major impact on the big German agrochemical firms Bayer and BASF because they don't produce it. Even Monsanto, which is in the process of being acquired by Bayer in a \$66 billion deal, wouldn't suffer a major hit. Analyst Jonas Oxgaard of investment firm Bernstein estimated that a ban would cost Monsanto less than \$100 million in profits. It generates an estimated \$3 billion in revenue from glyphosate and sells most of it in North and South America where it remains in strong demand.

Seconde, DNL, How to feed the world debate : **shall we ban glyphosate ?**

Sources at Bayer said that its merger plans wouldn't be affected if the EU refused to renew the license. But other makers of the chemical, which has been off-patent for the last 17 years, would be hit, especially Chinese firms that have established themselves as the main suppliers in Europe.

In fact, agrochemicals firms such as BASF could profit from a ban if it forces farmers to use other weedkillers. The producers would have to choose between more expensive and less effective weedkillers or spend time physically removing weeds with ploughs, which would increase fuel costs and raise the specter of soil erosion.

And winemakers have warned that without glyphosate, it will be all but impossible for them to treat the soil in steep-sloping vineyards. That's why agricultural researchers at the University of Göttingen have recommended relicensing glyphosate but limiting its use.

Farmer Jochen Hartmann, whose farm in the village of Rettmer has won government funding because of its contribution to biodiversity, uses glyphosate himself and said farmers were already starting to use it more cautiously. He urged authorities to find a compromise, for example by allowing its continued use over a transition period.

"After that, farmers must be given help to find alternative methods," said Mr. Hartmann, whose family has tilled the fields of Rettmer for 19 generations.

An outright ban of the weedkiller would be dangerous, he warned. "It would only lead to farmers using other chemicals that aren't necessarily any better."

Bert-Friedrich Fröndhoff leads a team of reporters that covers the chemicals, health care and services industries at Handelsblatt. Silke Kersting covers politics for Handelsblatt.

Seconde, DNL, How to feed the world debate : **shall we ban glyphosate ?**

THE GLYPHOSATE BAN: A CAUTIONARY TALE FOR THE U.S.

10/27/2017 / Mitchell Gunter / Freelance Writer

A political storm brewing in Europe over glyphosate, a common weed-killer, may soon spell the end of the product, with no viable replacements—all stemming from involvement by American liberal activists. On October 5th, 2017, Reuters reported that the European Commission was considering a 10-year extension on the license for glyphosate, but the licensing vote ultimately didn't take place. American anti-pesticide activists and European policymakers had previously debated heavily over the continued use of the herbicide.

Later, on October 11th, the European Parliament held a hearing on the "Monsanto Papers," documents released by US plaintiffs that allege exposure to glyphosate causes cancer. However, some of the first to speak at the hearing weren't Europeans.

American liberal activists Chris Portier, the former advisor to the Environmental Defense Fund, and Carey Gilliam, the research director of US Right to Know, were the first to speak at the hearing. Kate Guyton, an International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) scientist who oversaw a study alleging glyphosate is unsafe, was also present.

Moreover, only two out of seven speakers represented EU regulatory agencies, begging the question as to why European lawmakers are relying on American activists for information, rather than their own agencies. Ultimately, the hearing amounted to a condemnation of glyphosate with limited evidence.

Furthermore, Dr. Jose Tarazona, a scientist with the European Food Safety Authority, noted that agencies in Canada, Japan, and New Zealand had declared glyphosate safe.

Despite all the evidence, the EU is dragging its feet over extending glyphosate's license although major European regulators have already declared the herbicide non-carcinogenic, considering IARC's pronouncement of glyphosate as "probably carcinogenic."

This political involvement is unfortunate, as glyphosate was developed over many years and has been in use for over four decades. Farmers have used the herbicide since the 1970s, and it has no serious alternatives.

A huge hole in IARC's pronouncement is that it failed to account relevant studies in its evaluation, refusing to utilize the yet unpublished Agricultural Health Study, funded by the United States, which has evaluated pesticides over 30 years. IARC did not review this data due to a rule preventing it from considering unpublished research.

Clearly, glyphosate can be declared safe until relevant data declares otherwise. Vinegar, an alternative to glyphosate, has demonstrated toxicity in soil, while industrial herbicides are even more toxic, such as paraquat which has been linked with Parkinson's disease in studies by the National Institutes of Health.

France, which wants to ban glyphosate, has infuriated its farmers, as 85% of them utilize the herbicide. Farmers have dubbed the ban "unacceptable," and an Ipsos study has expressed that a glyphosate ban would cost the agricultural sector approximately \$1.3 billion.

The political spat over glyphosate mirrors efforts by environmental activists in the U.S., and shows the danger of allowing activists like Portier to affect policy based on sound logic and reason.

Thankfully, for farmers in the United States, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has given glyphosate its approval, but American companies operating in European markets should exercise an element of caution, as some are calling the debate, "the tip of the regulatory iceberg."

Seconde, DNL, How to feed the world debate : **shall we ban glyphosate ?**

Bayer's Monsanto faces 8,000 lawsuits on glyphosate

FRANKFURT (Reuters) - The number of U.S. lawsuits brought against Bayer's (BAYGn.DE) newly acquired Monsanto has jumped to about 8,000, as the German drugmaker braces for years of legal wrangling over alleged cancer risks of glyphosate-based weedkillers.

FILE PHOTO: Monsanto Co's Roundup is shown for sale in Encinitas, California, U.S., June 26, 2017. REUTERS/Mike Blake/File Photo

Bayer had previously disclosed 5,200 such lawsuits against Monsanto, which it acquired in a \$63 billion deal completed in June.

"The number of plaintiffs in both state and federal litigation is approximately 8,000 as of end-July. These numbers may rise or fall over time but our view is that the number is not indicative of the merits of the plaintiffs' cases," Bayer Chief Executive Werner Baumann told analysts in a conference call on Thursday.

Bayer shares have lost more than 10 percent since Monsanto was ordered on Aug. 10 to pay \$289 million in damages in the first U.S. lawsuit over glyphosate-based weedkillers such as Roundup and Ranger Pro.

The legal headache adds to a number of distractions for Bayer, such as falling consumer care product sales and a rebuke on production practices from the U.S. drugs watchdog, as it seeks to strengthen its drug development pipeline and has begun integrating Monsanto into its organisation.

"While this is disappointing, it is not surprising. Indeed, in our litigation scenario analysis, we assumed a doubling of cases to 10,400," said Alistair Campbell, analyst at brokerage Berenberg.

Bayer shares were down 1.8 percent at 1600 GMT while the German blue chip index .GDAXI was up 0.2 percent.

CEO Baumann reiterated Bayer's view that the jury's verdict on Aug. 10 was inconsistent with the science-based conclusions of regulators.

Bayer said it will initially petition the judge to reverse the jury's verdict from Aug. 10, and "if necessary" challenge the ruling with California appellate courts, which will take at least a year.

When asked whether Bayer would consider settling cases out of court, he said: "We will vigorously defend this case and all upcoming cases."

Bayer executives on the call stressed that demand for glyphosate and seeds for crops that tolerate the broad-spectrum herbicide had not been affected by the verdict.

"Nothing whatsoever has changed in the regulatory status of the product. There is simply very high demand, and has been for many decades for glyphosate. It is an invaluable tool for growers," said Liam Condon, the head of Bayer's newly enlarged Crop Science division.

Bayer also said on Thursday that it sees no reason to re-assess the legal risks from Monsanto.

Last week Bayer, which is retiring the Monsanto name, launched the integration of Monsanto into its organisation. That is seen as a daunting task even without the litigation, almost two years after it signed the \$63 billion deal.

Bayer's second-quarter results, due on Sept. 5, would include provisioning for legal defence costs but no money would at that point be set aside for any possible future damages, finance chief Wolfgang Nickl said.

Reporting by Ludwig Burger; Editing by Douglas Busvine and Susan Fenton

Seconde, DNL, How to feed the world debate : **shall we ban glyphosate ?**

Germany + 13 Other Countries Say No to Glyphosate: What About the U.S.?

Organic Consumers Association

Germany's agricultural minister, Julia Kloeckner, announced April 17 that she was finalizing a draft regulation to end the use of glyphosate, the world's most heavily used herbicide in history. Glyphosate is the key active ingredient in Monsanto's Roundup weedkiller.

"I am planning a regulatory draft as a first building block in the strategy to minimize use of glyphosate," Kloeckner said. Her plans include a ban on the weedkiller in household gardens, parks and sport facilities, and "massive restrictions" on its use in agriculture.

The move was welcomed by many German politicians, as it cements a previous agreement in February between members of Chancellor Angela Merkel's Christian Democrats and the Social Democrats to significantly reduce, and ultimately ban, glyphosate-containing products.

Glyphosate, which was classified as "probably carcinogenic to humans" by the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) in March 2015, is hotly contested in Europe.

If Germany passes this regulation, it will join many other countries that are saying no to glyphosate.

According to Baum, Hedlund, Aristei & Goldman, a U.S. law firm representing hundreds of plaintiffs suing Monsanto for allegedly causing their cancer, the following countries have banned or placed restrictions on the use of glyphosate:

- Belgium: In 2017, the Flemish government banned individual use of glyphosate and voted against relicensing glyphosate in the EU. The country was one of six EU member states to sign a letter to the EU Commission calling for "an exit plan for glyphosate."
- Bermuda: The island outlawed the private and commercial sale of all glyphosate-based herbicides.
- Colombia: In 2015, the country forbid the use of glyphosate to eliminate illegal plantations of coca, often used to make cocaine, due to concern that the herbicide causes cancer. However in 2017, the country reinstated its controversial fumigation program. But instead of using aerial fumigation, glyphosate is now sprayed manually, from the ground.
- Netherlands: Dutch officials have banned all non-commercial use of glyphosate.
- Sri Lanka: In 2014, Sri Lankan President Mahinda Rajapaksa mandated an all-out ban on glyphosate, following a study linking Roundup to Fatal Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD), the second-leading cause of death among males in the country. Sri Lanka was the first country to issue a nationwide ban on glyphosate.
- El Salvador: Passed a law banning glyphosate, citing the same study linking fatal chronic kidney disease to Roundup.
- Middle Eastern countries, including Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, Bahrain, Oman and the United Arab Emirates, have stopped glyphosate use.
- France: President Emmanuel Macron announced in November 2017, an outright ban on glyphosate, to take effect "within three years."

So why hasn't the U.S. banned glyphosate?

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has been conducting its required 15-year re-registration review of glyphosate since 2009. The agency was supposed to re-approve or ban the chemical by the end

Seconde, DNL, How to feed the world debate : **shall we ban glyphosate ?**

of 2015. But after the IARC panel of 17 scientists unanimously agreed glyphosate was a probable human carcinogen, the EPA was forced to take its review of the chemical more seriously.

The EPA is seeking public input until April 30 on the health impacts of glyphosate. You can make your voice heard by clicking [here](#).

As we wait for the federal government to act, at least the state of California has taken a bold step against the weedkiller. In July 2017, the state added glyphosate to its Proposition 65 list. Monsanto filed a lawsuit after the state announced its plan to list the chemical, but the agrochemical giant lost its appeal earlier this month after a California appellate court sided with the State of California and the Center for Food Safety saying glyphosate can be listed as a probable carcinogen under Proposition 65.

Several towns and cities in many states—including California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Maryland, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon and Virginia—have also stood their ground against the toxic chemical.

“For decades now, the public has been exposed, unknowingly and against their will, to glyphosate, despite mounting evidence that this key active ingredient in Monsanto’s Roundup herbicide is harmful to human health and the environment,” International Director of Organic Consumers Association Ronnie Cummins explained. “Now, is the time to increase pressure around the world and encourage more states, cities and countries to ban this toxic chemical.”

The Organic Consumers Association is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit public interest and consumer advocacy organization. Stay up-to-date with OCA’s news and alerts by signing up for our newsletter.

Seconde, DNL, How to feed the world debate : **shall we ban glyphosate ?**

Glyphosate, 1 million signatures are needed to ban it in Europe

ENVIRONMENT Published on 09 FEB 2017 by TOMMASO PERRONE

A million signatures are needed to call on the European Commission to ban glyphosate in the EU. This isn't an ordinary online petition.

This isn't a petition like any other. It's an official collection of signatures aimed at urging the European Commission to propose a European ban on glyphosate. For the petition to be effective, the European Citizens Initiative (ECI) needs to be signed by at least 1 million citizens (out of a total of 510 million) residing in at least 7 of the 28 countries making up the European Union (EU), within a year.

What is glyphosate and why should it be banned

Glyphosate is currently the most widely used herbicide in agriculture. It is the active ingredient of the Roundup weed killer, whose patent was owned by Monsanto until 2001. Normally, it is associated with cultivations – like soy – modified genetically to resist big doses of the herbicide. A report by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), which is part of the United Nations' World Health Organisation, published in the journal *The Lancet Oncology*, defined glyphosate as "likely carcinogenic" to humans. Instead, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) says that it's "not likely to be carcinogenic to humans" – but was accused of having based its assessment on a German study financed by companies producing herbicides.

The initiative to ask a total European ban on glyphosate started on the 8th of February and is promoted by a coalition of associations committed to protecting the environment and health across 15 countries, including #StopGlifosato, Greenpeace, WeMove, Pesticide Action Network, the Health and Environment Alliance and Corporate Europe Observatory.

We must act by the summer

In June 2016 the European Commission had to tackle the fact that the 28 member countries hadn't taken a decision on the herbicide's authorisation, also due to public opinion calling strongly for its ban. So, it decided unilaterally to renew the authorisation for glyphosate's use for a further 18 months, until 2017. This means that it's imperative the European Citizens Initiative reach its goal by the summer.

"This year we have the opportunity of banning glyphosate from our fields and our food. Evermore water courses in Italy and all over Europe are contaminated by this herbicide, classified as probably carcinogenic by IARC. Traces of glyphosate have been found in food, beverages and human urine. The message to the Commission is clear: people's interests and health should come before agrochemical companies' profit," said Federica Ferrario, head of Greenpeace Italia's sustainable agriculture campaign.

For a sustainable agriculture

The text underlying the ECI also denounces the lack of transparency in European procedures for approving pesticides. Thus, it urges a reform of approval procedures through the definition of binding reduction objectives on glyphosate use in the EU. The fight to ban glyphosate, therefore, needs to be viewed as part of broader framework aimed at achieving a new model of sustainable agriculture.