

## Europe's battle over glyphosate 'was never about science'

*André Heitz is an agronomist and a former international civil servant for the United Nations. . . .*

[T]he European Commission decided on 29 June 2016 to extend the . . . authorisation of glyphosate. . . until the end of 2017 . . . .

The limited extension . . . does not put an end to the glyphosate saga. . . . With the European Union bullied by national politicking as member states try to shift the onus to the Commission, similar debates will most likely restart after the extension lapses.

. . . .  
[Agency findings of glyphosate's safety] were either ignored or casually dismissed by activists with a standard answer: these bodies are . . . are in the pocket of 'Big Agri'. . . . [T]he controversy has been gravely polluted by the "conflict of interests" argument deployed by . . . entities depicting themselves as "NGOs" and propagated by the media. The sad truth is that the debate over glyphosate has never truly been about science, but has been a war waged by activists, . . . where scientific arguments are accepted only if they are liked. But that won't change the scientific fact that glyphosate is safe.

**The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: [Glyphosate: Understanding the controversy](#)**