19 November 2012

To: The President and Executive Directors of the EBRD
CC: Miljan Zdrale, Operations Leader, Monsanto Risk Sharing project, zdralem@ebrd.com
Olga Filippova, Civil Society Adviser filippoo@ebrd.com

Dear President Chakrabarti and Executive Directors of the EBRD,

Open letter: We will not share Monsanto's risk

We recently learned that the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development is proposing to take up to USD 40 million unfunded risk participation in Monsanto Company’s portfolio of deferred payment sales contracts for the pre-financing of seeds and crop protection products to medium-large farmers and a small selection of key distributors in Bulgaria, Hungary, Russia, Serbia, Turkey, and Ukraine.

Monsanto has a long and controversial history of transferring its risks onto other people and the environment, and support for this company and the agricultural model it represents is highly inappropriate for a multilateral development bank committed in its statute to promoting “environmentally sound and sustainable development”.

We are not willing for our governments to use public money to cover Monsanto’s risks, and ask the EBRD not to move forward with assessment of this project for the reasons given below. Instead, the bank must consider what it can do to boost truly sustainable, diverse, climate-change-resilient and predominantly small-scale farming in its region of operations.

Lack of additionality
The EBRD is supposed to support the development of a competitive private sector only when the applicant is not able to obtain sufficient financing or facilities elsewhere on reasonable terms and conditions. Monsanto is the world’s largest seed company and a Fortune 500 company — how can the EBRD claim additionality here?

Supporting over-concentration and lack of competition in the agricultural inputs sector
The global seed industry is one of the most over-concentrated industries in the world, with just 3 companies controlling more than half (53%) of the global commercial market for seed in 2009. Monsanto alone controlled 27 percent of the global seed industry. Likewise, in the same year, the top 6 agrochemical companies accounted for over 72 percent of the agrochemical market, with Monsanto coming 4th with 10 percent of the global market. The EBRD, following its mission to promote functional market economies, is supposed to promote greater competition. How does the bank hope to increase competition by supporting such a globally dominant company?

Unsustainable model of agriculture and misplaced approach to ‘food security’
The EBRD cites alleviating food security concerns as one of the justifications for its plans to support Monsanto, along with promoting sustainable agriculture. However, supporting Monsanto is not likely to contribute to either food security or sustainability.

Food security, according to the UN, is “a situation that exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life”.

1 Article 13 (vii) of the EBRD’s basic documents
2 http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune500/2012/full_list/201_300.html
In 2009 the World Bank and UN-backed International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development reported that North America and Europe have increased productivity and production substantially during the last few decades but that this has also undermined the achievement of development and sustainability goals within the region and in other sub-global regions by contributing to environmental degradation, increasing inequity in wealth and assets in the food system, increasing the vulnerability of livelihoods dependent on agriculture and contributing to diet-related diseases, obesity and overweight. In other words, high food production volumes have come at a high cost and are not sufficient in themselves to guarantee food security.

This situation seems set to worsen given the onset of what the New Economics Foundation has called the global 'triple crunch,' encompassing a credit-fuelled financial crisis, accelerating climate change and an encroaching peak in oil production, all of which will affect both food production and people's ability to access food.

However, supporting Monsanto, with its agribusiness model that is dependent on chemical-dependent monocultural production, will not help the EBRD to promote environmental sustainability.

The company's flagship agrochemical product is glyphosate. Although originally marketed as a rather mild, safe chemical, glyphosate has now been found to have numerous negative health impacts. It causes birth defects in very low doses, and it has been found to cause the death of human cells, to damage human embryonic and placenta cells, to damage DNA in human cells, to be an endocrine disruptor, and to promote skin cancer. Glyphosate can also affect biodiversity. According to UK farm-scale evaluations, glyphosate use reduces seed banks in arable fields, limiting the food that is available to species further up the food chain, including birds. Glyphosate also has a toxic effect on a range of amphibian species.

Monocultural production is the opposite of what is needed in an era of climate change adaptation, when the only chance for resilient crop production lies in genetic diversity in order to survive rapidly changing and unstable conditions. This must include both a diversity of crops, and diversity of varieties within those crop types. Monsanto and others may develop crops with various traits, but even if the crops do what the companies promise (see chronology below), relying on monocultures will always prove unreliable in the long term.

---


Companies like Monsanto have contributed to a massive decrease in genetic diversity of crops globally during the last few decades by selling uniform hybrids instead of regionally diverse open-pollinated varieties. The aggressive promotion of patented seeds and hybrids and seed-chemical packages governed by contracts represents a threat to food security by threatening the centuries-old practice of seed-saving and developing locally appropriate and diverse varieties.

Earlier this year Monsanto announced plans to intensively expand its maize seed production capacity in central and eastern Europe. But some countries in the region are already over-dependent on the crop. In Serbia in 2011, for example, almost half of the arable crop area was sown with maize. This year, the hazards of putting all one’s eggs in one basket were highlighted when drought rendered the corn harvest in eastern Europe very poor and Serbia lost up to 70 percent of its maize crop.

In light of these new conditions, the EBRD needs to re-visit its concepts of sustainable agriculture and food security. If we are to stand a chance of overcoming these crises and ensuring that there is a sufficient and accessible food supply, agriculture must be rapidly transformed to be resilient to chaotic climate conditions. It must also be weaned off oil for agrochemicals, machinery and long-distance transportation, and must be low-input in order to be affordable for small farmers. Rather than regarding small farmers as an unavoidable side-product in the global agricultural system, they must be put at the centre of it.

Repeated studies from various countries have found that small farms are currently more productive per unit area than large ones in terms of value and that agro-ecological approaches can bring large further gains without threatening sustainability. Out of the countries involved in the Monsanto project, Russian ‘household plots’ (farms of less than one hectare) in 2010 took up only 5.17 percent of agricultural land in the country but produced 49.3 percent of agricultural output. A study of farming in Turkey found that in 2002 farms of less than one hectare were twenty times as productive as farms of over ten hectares. This is not solely because of their size but is at least partly because of the more diverse crops produced.

The UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Olivier de Schutter, has pointed out the need to concentrate on methods of farming that support crop diversity and small-scale farming: “Today, most efforts are made towards large-scale investments in land – including many instances of land grabbing – and towards a ‘Green Revolution’ model to boost food production: improved seeds, chemical fertilisers and machines. But scant attention has been paid to agroecological methods that have been shown to improve food production and

20 The widest study ever conducted on agroecological approaches covered 286 projects in 57 developing countries, representing a total surface of 37 million hectares: the average crop yield gain was 79%. Jules Pretty et al: Resource-Conserving Agriculture Increases Yields in Developing Countries, 2006 http://www.essex.ac.uk/bs/bs_staff/pretty/Pretty_etal_ES&T_2006_Vol40(4)_pp1114-19.pdf
Monsanto – should we trust this company with our food?
Monsanto’s chequered history – taking in products as varied and controversial as aspartame, Agent Orange, bovine growth hormone and GMOs – is widely known and is sufficient to raise serious questions at the EBRD about whether such a company should be supported with public financing. However as the EBRD is tasked with promoting transition and improving corporate governance, we are aware that the bank is likely to be most interested in whether the company is interested in changing and can be encouraged to improve its practices. Our answer is a resounding ‘No’.

In the last two years alone the company has been involved in a series of controversies ranging from being sued by various governments to suing farmers, from lobbying against GMO labelling legislation to crop failures and GMO contamination. Some of the most serious cases are outlined in the annex to this letter.

The EBRD, in its Environmental and Social Policy, commits to assess its client’s ability to manage and address all relevant social and environmental risks and impacts of its business and operations, and to assess the client’s compliance record with applicable laws and regulations of the jurisdictions in which the project operates that pertain to environmental and social matters, including those laws implementing host country obligations under international law. The cases outlined in the annex show that Monsanto is neither willing nor able to manage the social and environmental impact of its business, nor to comply with applicable laws and regulations. Moreover it is unwilling to admit when it has caused harm and spends a considerable amount of effort actively covering up information which would assist in mitigating the damage done. Although the EBRD’s project summary points out that GMOs will not be involved in the project, it is extremely difficult for the bank to monitor this in reality (see the Hungary contamination incident in the Annex), and even if true it would not make Monsanto a fit and proper company to receive your support.

Given all the above, we ask the EBRD not to move forward with assessment of this project and instead to consider what it can do to boost truly sustainable, diverse, climate-change-resilient small-scale farming in its region of operations.

Yours sincerely,

Ionut Apostol
EBRD Co-ordinator
CEE Bankwatch Network

This letter is supported by the following organisations:

1. Marco Contiero, EU Policy Director, Genetic Engineering and Sustainable Agriculture, Greenpeace European Unit
2. Magda Stockiewicz, Director, Friends of the Earth Europe
3. Darcey O’Callaghan, International Policy Director, Food & Water Watch, International
4. Renée Vellvé, GRAIN, International
5. Martin Pigeon, Corporate Europe Observatory
6. Gabriella Zanzanaini, Director of European Affairs, Food & Water Watch Europe

7. Inga Zarafyan, President, EcoLur, Yerevan, Armenia
8. Louise Sales, Friends of the Earth Australia
9. Karin Vasquez, Chair, Macarthur Future Food Forum, Australia
10. Scott Kinnear, The Safe Food Foundation, Australia
11. Jo Immig, Coordinator, National Toxics Network, Australia
12. Bob Phelps, Executive Director, Gene Ethics, Australia
13. Janet Grogan, FOODwatch, Australia
14. Anna Clements, South Australian Genetic Food Information Network, Australia
15. Maryanne Bell, Permaculture Blue Mountains, Australia
16. John Seed, Rainforest Information Centre, Australia
17. Fran Murrell, MADGE Australia Inc
18. Thomas Wenidoppler, Director, ECA Watch Austria
19. Irmi Salzer, ÖBV-Via Campesina Austria
20. Heidemarie Porstner, GMO-campaigner, GLOBAL 2000-Friends of the Earth Austria
21. Beate Koller, Arche Noah, Austria
22. Jakob Mussi, EU-Advocacy Manager, Global Responsibility - Austrian Platform for Development and Humanitarian Aid, Austria
23. Albena Simeonova, President of the Board, Foundation for Environment and Agriculture, Bulgaria
24. Milen Stoyanov, President of the Board, Bulgarian Organic Products Association
25. Borislav Sanov, National coordinator, Food sovereignty – Bulgaria
26. Genady Kondarev, Board member and Ivaylo Popov, anti-GMO campaigner, Za Zemiata, Bulgaria
27. Todor Slavov, anti-GMO campaigner, PECS, Bulgaria
28. Bernard Ivic, President, Zelena akcija – Friends of the Earth Croatia
29. Atana Grbic, Eko Zadar, Croatia
30. Ruskalka Major, Udruga Gredica, Croatia
31. Bruno Motik, Zelena mreža aktivističkih udruga (ZMAG), Croatia
32. Patrik Juricic, Pineta, Croatia
33. Marijan Galović, Institute for Rural Development and Ecology, Croatia
34. Zlatko Burić and Miroslja Žic, Eco-tourist Association Šolta, Croatia
35. Tomislav Rogošić, Divina Natura, Croatia
36. Cvjeta Biscevic, Participacija, Croatia
37. Šimo Beneš, Brodsko Ekološko društvo, Croatia
38. Dušica Radojičić, Zelena Istra, Croatia
39. Josip Vidović, EKO, Oroslavje, Croatia
40. Darko Krušelj, Petrože, Krušljevo Selo, Oroslavje, Josip Vidović,
41. Dunja Horvatinić, Savez ekoloških udruga KZŽ, Croatia
42. Gabrijela Medunčić Orlić, Sunce, Croatia
43. Denis Frančišković, Eko Pan, Croatia
44. Klára Sutlová, Centrum pro dopravu a energetiku, Czech Republic
45. Karin Kirtsi, Executive Director, Estonian Green Movement-FoE Estonia
46. Anastasia Pertsjonok, Board Member, MTÜ Ethical Links, Estonia
47. Silvia Lotman, Member of Executive Committee, Estonian Fund for Nature
48. Regine Richter, urgewald, Germany
49. Dr. Susanne Gura, Dachverband Kulturpflanzen- und Nutztiervielfalt e.V., Germany
50. Verein zur Erhaltung der Nutzpflanzenvielfalt e.V., Germany
51. Manana Kochladze, Green Alternative, Georgia
52. Manana Devidze, Doctor of Biology, Director, Foundation Caucasus Environment, Georgia
53. Sárkőzy Adrienn, Biokontroll Hungária Nonprofit Kft. (inspection and certification body of organic production in Hungary)
54. Hungarian Federation of Associations for Organic Farming
55. Vera Mora, ELTE Nature Conservation Club (ETK), Hungary
56. Istvan Farkas, Magyar Természetvédők Szövetsége (National Society of Conservationists, Friends of the Earth Hungary)
57. Giulia Franchi, Land Campaigner, Re:Common, Italy
58. Dana Yermolyonok, Director of the Center for Introduction of New Environmentally Safe Technologies, Kazakhstan
59. Sergey Solyanik, Consultant, Crude Accountability, Kazakhstan
61. Daniyar Serikov, Public Fund “Social Engineering”, Astana, Kazakhstan
62. Janis Ulme, Chair of the Board, Friends of the Earth Latvia
63. Alda Ozola, Latvian Green Movement, Latvia
64. Mr. Rimantas Brazulis, Chair, Lithuanian Green Movement/Friends of Earth Lithuania
65. Linas Vainius, member of the Board, Atgaja Community, Lithuania
66. Ana Colovic Lesoska, Executive Director, Eco-Sense, Macedonia
67. Huub Scheele, Both ENDS, Netherlands
68. Sir Julian Rose, ICPPC president, Jadwiga Łopata, Goldman Prize winner, ICPPC - International Coalition to Protect the Polish Countryside / Międzynarodowa Koalicja dla Ochrony Polskiej Wsi, Poland
69. Tomasz Włoszczowski, President, Social Ecological Institute / Społeczny Instytut Ekologiczny, Poland
70. Małgorzata Świderek, Vice President, Ośrodek Działań Ekologicznych “Źródła” / Center for Ecological Actions “Roots”, Poland
71. Lena Huppert, President, Foundation for Support of Culture and Civil Society Development / Fundacja Wspierania Rozwoju Kultury i Społeczeństwa Obywatelskiego, Poland
72. Jakub Skorupski, Vice-Chair, Green Federation GAJA/ Federacja Zielonych GAJA, Poland
73. Joanna Mieszko, President, Fundacja Aeris Futuro / Aeris Futuro Foundation, Poland
74. Anna Szmelcer, Chair, Stowarzyszenie Polska Wolna od GMO / GMO free Poland Association
75. Aleksandra Sonia Piwieniec, President, Fundacja Rolniczej Różnorodności Biologicznej AgriNatura / Foundation for Agricultural Biodiversity AgriNatura, Poland
76. Tomasz Czubachowski, President, Stowarzyszenie "Dla dawnych odmian i ras" / Association "For Old Breeds and Varieties", Poland
77. Joanna Furmaga – President, Związek Stowarzyszeń Polska Zielona Sieć / Alliance of Associations Polish Green Network
78. Barbara Polak, President, Stowarzyszenie Gospodarstw Agro i Ekoturystycznych Mazowieckie Wierzyby / Agro and Ecotourism Association "Mazovian Willows", Poland
79. Dariusz Dąbirowski, Chair, EKOLAND Oddział Wschodniomazowiecki Stowarzyszenie Producentów Żywności Metodami Ekologicznymi / EKOLAND Association of Ecoproducers of Food, Eastern-Mazovian Brand, Poland
80. Krzysztof Smolnicki, President, Fundacja Ekorozwoju / Foundation for Sustainable Development, Poland
81. Krzysztof Gorczyca, Chair, Towarzystwo dla Natury i Człowieka / Society for Nature and Humankind, Poland
82. Piotr Znaniecki, Chair, Stowarzyszenie na rzecz Ekorozwoju "Agro-Group" / The Association for Sustainable Development "Agro-Group", Poland
83. Marcin Wójtalik, Board member, Instytut Globalnej Odpowiedzialności / Institute for Global Responsibility, Poland
84. Jacek Kaliciuk, President, Zachodziopomorskie Towarzystwo Przyrodnicze / Westernpomeranian Society for Nature, Poland
85. Maria Staniszewska, President, Polski Klub Ekologiczny / Polish Ecological Club
86. Marcin Stoczkiwicz - Board member, Fundacja ClientEarth Poland / Foundation ClientEarth Poland
87. Stanisław Kondratiuk, representative, Fundacja Ekologiczna "Zielona Akcja" / Ecological Foundation "Green Action", Poland
88. Andrzej Żwawa, Board member, Koalicja Sprawiedliwego Handlu / Fair Trade Coalition, Poland
89. Agnieszka Bińkowska, representative, Stowarzyszenie "Ośrodek Kultur Świata" / Association "World Cultures Center", Poland
90. Monika Krauze, Director, Toruńskie Stowarzyszenie Ekologiczne Tilia / Torun Ecological Association "Tilia", Poland
91. Ramona Duminicioiu, President, Infomg, Romania
92. Ioana Ciuta, Executive Director, TERRA Mileniul III, Romania
93. Gabriel Paun, President, Agent Green, Gabriel Paun, Romania
94. Hans Hedrich, Vice-president, Sustainable Sighisoara, Romania
95. Nicolae Mercurean, President, Transmont Fagaras, Romania
96. János Márk-Nagy, Executive Director, Transylvanian Carpathian Society Satu Mare, Romania
97. Costel Popa, President, Center for Sustainable Policies – Ecopolis, Romania
98. Laszlo Potozky, Director, The Partnership Foundation, Romania
99. Stefania Simion, Executive Director, Centre for the Development of Environmental Resources, Romania
100. Mircea Ilie, Vice President, ViitorPlus, Romania
101. Payer Maria Magdalena, President, Heidenroslein Association, Romania
102. Andrei Mocanu, Vice President, Re-Generation, Romania
103. Save the Danube and the Delta, Romania
104. Vasile Gafiuc, President, Eco-Mountaineering Club “Green Origins” Suceava, Romania
105. Nadia Potoceanu, President, Activity Foundation, Romania
106. Vaslica Puran, President, Association for Sustainable Development “Lower Danube”, Romania
107. Kovacs Zoltan Csongor, President, Green Transylvania Association, Romania
108. Florin Gradinaru, President, Biosilva Association, Romania
109. Codruța Nedelcu, Executive Director, ARIN Association, Romania
110. Dr. Alexander Baranoff, Institute of Developmental Biology, Russian Academy of Science, Russia
111. Victoria Kopeykina, CIS Alliance for Biosafety, Moscow, Russia
112. Dr. Ivan P. Blokov, Campaign Director, Greenpeace Russia
113. Alexander Karpov, Assessment Center ECOM, Director, St.Petersburg, Russia
114. O.N. Pitsunova, Association “Partnership for development”, Saratov, Russia
115. A.A. Pinchuk, “Center for promotion of Environmental initiatives”, Saratov, Russia
116. S.G. Mukhachev, Tatarstan Russian Social-environmental Union, Russia
117. Elena Kruglikova, project manager of Kola Environmental Centre, Russia
118. Dmitriy Ryabov, co-chair, Non-Government Non-Profit Public Organization "Green Branch", Yaroslavl city, Russia
119. Nailiya Ibragimova, head of Murmansk Regional Youth Public Environmental Organisation "Nature and Youth", Murmansk, Russia
120. Svitoslav Zabelin, Goldman Prize winner-1993, Socio-Ecological Union International, Russia
121. Ruzica Rudic Vranic, Association for Economic Empowerment of Women, FEMINA CREATIVA, Serbia
122. Nataša Dnjeg, Director, CEKOR - Center for Ecology and Sustainable Development, Serbia
123. Milenko Srećković, POKRET ZA SLOBODU, Serbia
124. Tom Kucharz, Ecologistas en Acción, Spain
125. Magdaléna Grambličková, Executive Director, Friends of the Earth-CEPA, Slovakia
126. Civil association SOSNA, Slovakia
127. Civil association TATRY, Slovakia
128. Živica - Center for Environmental and Ethics Education, Slovakia
129. Ochranadelavných aktivít Trančin (Center for environmental activities Trenčín), Slovakia
130. LZ Vlk - Association for protection of forests, Slovakia
131. Association Slatinka, Slovakia
132. Association Živá Planéta (Living Planet), Slovakia
March 2011: Lawsuit launched by US farmers to protect themselves from Monsanto

Seventy-five family farmers, seed businesses, and agricultural organizations representing over 300,000 individuals and 4,500 farms bring a pre-emptive case against Monsanto in March 2011 in the Southern District of New York to defend themselves from nearly two dozen of Monsanto’s most aggressively asserted patents on GMO seed. They aim to protect themselves from Monsanto’s abusive lawsuits, fearing that if GMO seed contaminates their property despite their efforts to prevent such contamination, Monsanto will sue them for patent infringement. Every year Monsanto investigates over 500 farmers for patent infringement with its now notorious “seed police”. To date, 144 farmers have had lawsuits brought against them by Monsanto without a binding contract with the multinational corporation, while another 700 farmers have been forced to settle out of court for undisclosed sums. Some plaintiffs have simply stopped growing certain types of crops due to the threat of contamination.\(^\text{24}\)

May 2011: India farmer suicides

New York University publishes Every Thirty Minutes: Farmer Suicides, Human Rights, and the Agrarian Crisis in India revealing that more than a quarter of a million Indian farmers have committed suicide in the last 16 years—the largest wave of recorded suicides in human history. A great number of those affected are cash crop farmers, and cotton farmers in particular. In 2009 alone, the most recent year for which official figures are available, 17,638 farmers committed suicide — one farmer every 30 minutes. While the blame cannot be attributed only to one source, Monsanto’s Bt cotton seeds have been implicated in connection with a number of suicide cases as farmers took loans to pay for them which they could not then pay back after crop failures.\(^\text{25}\)


\(^{25}\) Center for Human Rights and Global Justice at New York University: Every Thirty Minutes: Farmer Suicides, Human Rights, and the Agrarian Crisis in India
July-August 2011: **Hungary GMO contamination**
Hungary destroys 8500-9000 hectares of corn due to GMO contamination from seeds originating from Monsanto. Monsanto claimed that the corn was not GMO. Farmers whose crops were destroyed were declared eligible to receive compensation of EUR 1320 per hectare.

August 2011: **India sues Monsanto for biopiracy**
The National Biodiversity Authority of India sues Monsanto and the company’s Indian partners who developed the Bt aubergine (eggplant) based on a complaint filed in 2010 by the Bangalore-based Environment Support Group, which alleges that the developers violated India’s Biological Diversity Act of 2002 by using local aubergine varieties in developing Bt aubergine without prior approval from the NBA.

January 2012: **Berlin: Glyphosate herbicides found in human urine**
Ithaca journals reports that a study was conducted in December 2011 of an urban population in Berlin. The urine of city workers, journalists and lawyers, who had no direct contact with glyphosate, was examined for glyphosate contamination. The study found glyphosate in all urine samples at values ranging from 0.5 to 2 ng glyphosate per ml urine (drinking water limit: 0.1 ng/ml). None of the examinees had direct contact with agriculture.

13 February 2012: **Monsanto found guilty for chemical poisoning in France**
A French court declared Monsanto guilty of chemical poisoning of French grain grower Paul Francois, who says he suffered neurological problems including memory loss, headaches and stammering after inhaling Monsanto’s Lasso herbicide while cleaning the tank of his crop sprayer in 2004. He blames the agri-business giant for not providing adequate warnings on the product label. Lasso, a pre-emergent soil-applied herbicide that has been used since the 1960s to control grasses and broadleaf weeds in farm fields, was banned in France in 2007 following an EU Directive after the product had already been withdrawn in some other countries.

5 March 2012: **Corn rootworm resistance to Monsanto corn**
22 corn entomologists write to the US Environmental Protection Agency expressing concern that about western corn rootworm developing resistance to Monsanto’s Cry3Bb1 rootworm-protected transgenic corn and the implication of this for corn production in the US.

April 2012: **Brazil: Court rules Monsanto seed levy illegal**
A judge in Rio Grande do Sul rules that a levy being imposed by Monsanto on sales of Roundup Ready soya beans is illegal, as the patents relating to Roundup Ready soya beans have already expired in Brazil. Monsanto has been charging farmers a levy of 2 percent of their sales of Roundup Ready soya beans, which now account for an estimated 85 percent of Brazil’s soya-bean crop, as it claims that they are smuggled. The company also tests Brazilian soya beans that are sold as non-GM — if they turn out to be Roundup Ready, the company charges the farmers responsible for the crops some 3 percent of their sales. However the farmers who brought the case to court in 2009 say that most seeds are now bought legally, thus farmers pay twice –
once for the seeds and once for the levy - and that it has proved impossible to keep GM and non-GM seeds separated. The judge ordered Monsanto to stop collecting royalties, and return those collected since 2004 — or pay back a minimum of USD2 billion. Monsanto appealed and the case is not yet concluded. In June 2012 the judges of the Brazilian Supreme Court of Justice ruled against Monsanto in a parallel case brought by the company aimed at damage limitation, deciding unanimously that the ruling by the Justice Tribune of Rio Grande do Sul, once it is made, should apply nationwide.33

30 May 2012: Switzerland – unauthorised GMO rapeseed growing wild
Greenpeace International published a press release stating that GM oilseed rape (Canola) had been found growing wild in Basel’s port area in Switzerland. Greenpeace Switzerland tested 136 oilseed rape plants and found 29 that tested positive for GM and were identified as Monsanto’s herbicide-tolerant canola, GT73 (also called RT73).34

5 July 2012: Appeal filed in US farmers preventative lawsuit case
Seventy-five family farmers, seed businesses, and agricultural organizations representing over 300,000 individuals and 4,500 farms filed a brief with the United States Court of Appeals asking the appellate court to reverse a lower court’s decision from February dismissing their protective legal action against agricultural giant Monsanto’s patents on genetically engineered seed. 35

September 2012: Argentina: Farm manager and crop spraying pilot receive conditional three year sentence for pollution and harm to public health
Several years of research and campaigning by a group of mothers in the Ituzaingó district of Cordoba who noticed a high level of medical problems in their neighbourhood leads to a ‘guilty’ verdict for a farm manager and crop spraying pilot accused of breaking local regulations on the spraying of agrochemicals endosulfan and glyphosate (Monsanto’s Roundup) over populated areas.36

October 2012: Brazil: Mato Grosso court orders suspension of royalty payments collections
An appellate court in Mato Grosso upholds an injunction requested by a group of growers to stop fee collections in the state before a trial challenging patents for the genetically modified beans. Growers say the patent on the original Roundup Ready soybeans expired in 2010, ending their obligation to pay Monsanto a technology fee on the seeds. Monsanto says that Brazilian law extends the patent to 2014, when it expires in the US.37

22 October 2012: Monsanto spends USD 8.1 million opposing GM food labelling in California
In the run-up to California’s vote on Proposition 37 on the labelling of GM food, Monsanto has been by far the biggest funder of the campaign to keep Californians in the dark about what they are eating.38 In spite of widespread support for labelling reported by opinion polls, the Proposition is defeated.

38 California Right to Know website: http://www.carighttoknow.org/