



Press release

Générations Futures demonstrates that many of the toxic effects of glyphosate highlighted by French medical research (Inserm) are scandalously ignored by health agencies!

Générations Futures calls on the French government to follow INSERM's warnings by voting against the re-authorisation of glyphosate!

Speaking on 27 February 2023 at the Salon de l'Agriculture on the possible withdrawal of certain dangerous pesticides, Prime Minister Elisabeth Borne said: "***Our approach is based on science and the opinions of scientists.... The other cardinal point is that we will not compromise with public health.***" (Le Monde, 27 February 2023).

Générations Futures agrees with this position and is delighted that today **Madame Borne has the opportunity to put these principles** into practice by demanding that science is really used to assess glyphosate at European level. Explanations:

France is probably going to follow the opinion of the European Food Safety Agency (EFSA), which considers that "there is no area of critical concern, either for the environment or for human health", and vote in favour of renewing the authorisation of glyphosate at the next meetings of the European committee responsible for ruling on this issue, the Scopaff, arguing that it is following the opinion of "the scientists".

However, in 2021, Inserm published a collective report in which it presented a very different analysis from that of the agencies on several points concerning the toxicity of glyphosate. In particular, Inserm's analysis suggests that glyphosate "appears to have" endocrine disrupting properties, which runs counter to EFSA's conclusions.

So, are the opinions of the regulatory agencies really representative of the opinion of "the scientists" and the state of science on the issue? How can we explain the differences in analysis between the regulatory agencies and the research institute?

Générations futures attempts to answer these 2 questions in a new report highlighting the differences between the Inserm analysis and the regulatory assessment of glyphosate on a number of major points such as genotoxicity and oxidative stress, effects on the microbiota, mitochondrial toxicity, effects on reproduction and endocrine disruption and neurotoxic effects.

To do this, we studied Inserm's collective expertise in detail, and looked to see

-> how the agencies have analysed the points raised by Inserm.

-> how the studies cited by Inserm in its report were taken into account in the regulatory dossier.

The results are clear: here is a summary of our research into the differences of opinion between Inserm and the Agencies on 6 key points:

a summary of our research

INSERM*

VS

EFSA
ECHA*

Genotoxicity

Takes into account 18 university studies and indicates that glyphosate can induce oxidative stress and genotoxic damage that can lead to the appearance of mutations and cancers.

Did not include any academic studies in their assessment and considered that glyphosate may induce oxidative stress but is not genotoxic.

Reprotoxic effects and endocrine disruptors

Took into account 21 university studies and insisted on the endocrine disrupting potential of glyphosate

Took into account 1 university study solely for their assessment and considered that glyphosate had no endocrine disrupting effects.

Mitochondrial toxicity

Observe mitochondrial toxicity of glyphosate and stress a possible link with neurodegenerative pathologies

Do not assess mitochondrial toxicity

Consideration of the epigenetic effects

Took into account 5 university studies and observed an epigenetic mode of action of glyphosate and glyphosate-based herbicides

Did not assess epigenetic effects

Effects on the microbiota

Took into account 7 university studies showing deregulation of the microbiota and regretted that these effects were not taken into account in the assessment.

Do not include any university studies because the effects on the microbiota are not currently part of the regulatory assessment of pesticides.

Neurotoxicity

Took into account 9 university studies and showed that glyphosate-based products and glyphosate alone altered the concentrations of several neurotransmitters in different regions of the brain in rodents.

Do not include any academic studies in their assessment and state that there is insufficient evidence of an effect of glyphosate and glyphosate-based products on neurotransmitters.

* Inserm is the National Institute of Health and Medical Research
EFSA : European Food Safety Authority - ECHA : European Chemicals Agency

The full results of our analysis can be found in our full report, which can be [downloaded here](#) (in French for the moment).

Conclusions and requests:

Our analysis provides some answers to explain the differences in conclusions between regulatory agencies and academic researchers on the toxicity of glyphosate. Our analysis clearly shows that the agencies have completely ignored the assessment of certain key effects of glyphosate (e.g. effects on the microbiota) and almost systematically fail to take into account the solid academic studies cited by Inserm when assessing the weight of scientific evidence. As a result, the agencies' conclusions contradict Inserm's observations on several important aspects of glyphosate's toxicity, particularly its endocrine disrupting potential.

This is a real public health scandal to which France must respond by voting against the re-authorisation of glyphosate in Europe at the next Scopaff meetings, when the application for re-authorisation will be put to a vote by EU member states.

"The scandalous way in which the European regulatory agencies ignore certain important effects or entire sections of the scientific literature allows them to claim today that glyphosate is harmless to health or the environment", said François Veillerette, spokesperson for Générations Futures. *"The French government must not play along with this charade and must follow the advice of its public medical research. Indeed, INSERM, one of the world's leading scientific body, has clearly expressed its differences of opinion with the agencies on a number of essential points concerning glyphosate and human health. Now is the time for Mrs Borne to 'follow the scientists' advice', because 'you can't compromise with public health'!"* he added.

Press contact : F Veillerette, spokesman - +33(0)6 81 64 65 58