

## Global glyphosate herbicide ban would cause substantial damage to economy and environment, study shows

Graham Brookes | [Genetic Literacy Project](#) | January 3, 2018



A

new paper published in the journal *GM Crops and Food* [points to significant increases](#) in carbon emissions and a worse environmental impact associated with weed control practices if farmers around the world stopped planting glyphosate-tolerant crops. Decreased production of important agricultural commodities, higher prices and lower farm incomes would also be expected.

The peer-reviewed paper by [the author of this article] Graham Brookes of UK-based PG Economics Ltd and Farzad Taheripour and Wally Tyner of Purdue University examined the impacts that would arise if restrictions on glyphosate use resulted in the world no longer planting genetically modified herbicide-tolerant (GM HT) crops. It examined this from two perspectives; the "first round" farm level and aggregate impacts based on "removal" of the benefits associated with the widespread use of

Equilibrium (CGE) model GTAP-BIO (economic model which has been frequently used to examine the economic and environmental impacts of energy-agriculture-environment-trade subjects) that analyzes land use, land use emissions and economic impacts.

## **Context of GM HT crop use**

In 2015, the global cultivation of GM HT crops was 147.9 million hectares (365.47 million acres), a 200-fold increase from the 1996 level of 0.7 million hectares. The number of countries adopting biotech HT crop cultivation has also increased from three in 1996 to thirteen in 2015, with the United States leading the way in the use of this technology in crop production and accounting for 43% of total plantings in 2015. These crops are mostly found in soybeans, maize/corn, cotton and rapeseed/canola and accounted for 41% of the global plantings to these four crops in 2015.

Glyphosate is widely used in agriculture for weed control in many countries across a range of crops/uses and is a key part of the production system that uses GM HT crop technology. The GM HT technology allows for the 'over the top' spraying of these crops with the herbicide glyphosate.



## **Potential 'first-round' impacts of no longer using GM HT crops tolerant to glyphosate**

The 'first-round' impacts would result from the loss of the benefits associated with the adoption of GM herbicide tolerant (to glyphosate) crops. Specifically:

- An annual loss of global farm income of \$6.76 billion
- Lower levels of global soybean, corn and rapeseed/canola production equal to 18.6 million tons, 3.1 million tons and 1.44 million tons respectively
- An annual environmental loss associated with a net increase in the use of herbicides of 8.2 million kg of herbicide active ingredient (+1.7%), and a larger net negative environmental impact, as measured by the environmental impact

- Additional carbon emissions arising from increased fuel usage and decreased soil carbon sequestration, equal to the equivalent of adding 11.77 million cars to the roads

## Wider global welfare ‘second-round’ impacts arising from land use changes

Global production of soybeans and rapeseed/canola would fall by 3.7% and 0.7% respectively, partially offset by increases in production of other oilseeds (notably palm oil). These changes are different from the "first round" farm level impacts because the impact of no longer growing GM HT crops affects relative crop prices and this affects production of both crops in which GM HT technology is used and those where conventional production methods are used.

World prices of all grains, oilseeds and sugar are expected to rise, especially soybeans (+5.4%) and rapeseed/canola (+2%). The loss of GM HT technology reduces global welfare by \$7,408 million per year. The big losers are: China (-\$2.1 billion), US (-\$1.9 billion), and the EU (-\$0.9 billion). The losses in China and the EU reflect their high import dependence and the worse terms of trade arising from higher world prices. The US welfare losses largely reflect production efficiency losses associated with no longer using GM HT technology.

Land use changes will arise, with an additional cropping area of 762,000 hectares, including 167,000 hectares of deforestation. These land use changes are likely to induce the generation of an additional 234,000 million kg of carbon dioxide emissions, equivalent to the land use emissions from the production of 29.5 billion litres of corn ethanol in the US.

**Graham Brookes is an agricultural economist with UK-based PG Economics Ltd.**

**Read the full study: [The contribution of glyphosate to agriculture and potential impact of restrictions on use at the global level](#)**

322  
SHARES



5 Comments

Genetic Literacy Project

Norah G Fon



Recommend



Share

Sort by Best



JOIN THE DISCUSSION...



**toungincheek** • 7 days ago

As an agronomist I was involved with a group of farmers who were trying to reduce winter wind caused soil erosion and moisture loss. We tested many herbicides and none met our needs. The problem was excessive carry over residue or lack of broad spectrum weed control. Glyphosate was a life saver actually soil saver, it met our needs perfectly. Even at \$29.00 an acre growers used it sparingly. Twenty five years later the Reduced Tillages group gathered stats.

Soil Biomass increase 272 kg / acre/ year (organic matter increase)

Carbon sequestered 145 kg/ acre / year (bacterial activity increases with C/N ratio)

Fuel savings 6 litres / a/ year (1.5 US gal)

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



**Wackes Seppi** • 12 days ago

Economics are not my favorite subject.

My gut feeling is that the effect is not apocalyptic. Am I wrong?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



**Aguirre15** → Wackes Seppi • 12 days ago

Having been involved with glyphosate in one way or another for the better part of 40 years and having devoted quite a few of those years to trying to develop products to compete with it I can assure you an outright ban would be closer to apocalyptic than you think.

4 ^ | v • Reply • Share ›



**Jonathon Harrington** • 13 days ago

Oh dear, the 'organic greens' won't like this at all! I expect them to come up with some retort about it being 'biased' and or 'dishonest' and or 'inaccuarte'; anything other than facing the facts!

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



**Eric Bjerregaard** • 7 days ago

If this ever happens. I want plenty of warning. In order to buy enough to last for the rest of my days

^ | v • Reply • Share ›

#### ALSO ON GENETIC LITERACY PROJECT

**Deepening the nature v. nurture debate: How hormones impact development in**

1 comment • 11 hours ago

**Will Canadians accept unlabeled genetically modified salmon?**

2 comments • 7 days ago

### Geneticist Wayne Parrott: Non-GMO label promotes food safety

13 comments • 11 days ago



**thenextday** — Anyone who shops for food knows that slapping a non-GMO label on a product means they grocer, suppliers,

### Blight-resistant GMO potatoes could reduce pesticide use in Uganda

1 comment • 8 days ago



**Eric Bjerregaard** — Keep up the accurate reporting Please.

[Subscribe](#) [Add Disqus to your site](#) [Add Disqus](#) [Add Disqus](#) [Privacy](#)

**DISQUS**

### Recommended





Viewpoint: EU's glyphosate herbicide fight reveals limits of Europe-wide governance



322  
SHARES

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

technology timeline: Humans have manipulated genes since the 'dawn of civilization'



Viewpoint: Why it's time to start talking about a glyphosate herbicide replacement





## Genetic Literacy Project's Top 6 Stories for the Week – August 14, 2017



'Game changer' herbicide that could supplement glyphosate developed from anti-malaria chemical



Viewpoint: 'Radical change' needed to make global food system sustainable

## Talking Biotech

Explore the future of food and biotech

## GLP Biotech Profiles

Analyzing the critics shaping the debate

## Biotech 2.0 FAQs

Gene Editing/ CRISPR

Gene Therapy

Synthetic Biology

Epigenetics

Personal Genomics

Regulation & Bioethics

## GMO FAQs

Fundamentals

Farming & Food