

## ANNEXE M-5

### Questions for Anne-Claude Leflaive, President of "Terre et Vin du Monde"

(downloaded 18/07/06 from <http://www.leflaive.fr/english/presse/ogm-wdq.htm>, not yet available)

Bourgogne aujourd'hui, N° 36, Octobre-Novembre 2000 [questions for Anne-Claude Leflaive], "Don't let up the pressure". Interview by C. Tupinier

*The signatories of "The Beaune Appeal" created an independent association at the end of August: Terre et vins de Bourgogne. Presided over by Anne-Claude Leflaive, manager of Domaine Leflaive in Puligny-Montrachet (Côte-d'Or), this association considers itself a cell of vigil with several objectives: publication and distribution of information, and keeping an eye and taking a stand on the cultivation of the vine and the production of the wines of Burgundy in the face of new techniques, genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and other technological progress.*

*Madame Leflaive, what were the reactions to the appeal?*

There were many, but we mustn't above all let up the pressure. We have just learned that the EEC is preparing to vote on a draft law, "taking into account the development of GMOs". What does that mean! We are now going to try to extend our appeal to the European level. The vine is a long-lived plant, on which experiments take time; this is our good luck. On the other hand, there's an urgency concerning yeasts and all the micro-organisms used in oenology; if they proliferate through the air or water, there could be rapid contamination just where it is not wanted. The researchers are aware of this! In addition, we want to work with our own yeasts, and we think that the injection of external yeasts would make the wines less complex and less typical.

*"The appeal" contains some very alarmist words. Are GMOs necessarily negative a priori*

Not necessarily positive either a priori! We are trying to see things objectively and for us, the priority remains preserving the quality of the wines in the diversity of the terroirs. According to the initial elements communicated by the researchers, with GMOs the risk of losing this diversity exists.

*Viticultural practices rely considerably on chemical products. So can a vine that is made resistant - to mildew, for example - not be a better solution than spraying with copper sulphate or synthetic fungicides?*

Copper is toxic for the soil, that's true, but just working with methods that respect the environment more, such as biology or biodynamics, makes it possible to add very low doses of copper and sulphur, and to banish chemical products.

*There's a philosophical approach and a desire to frighten behind the words used...*

Genetic manipulation is the possibility of adding DNA coming from another species to the genome of a plant. Is this an obvious and natural approach? The researchers themselves do not know what, in the long term, will be the results of their manipulation. This is frightening all the same.

*The first heart transplants set off waves of protests, but today...*

Today, they're talking of transplanting the hearts of pigs in humans, and tomorrow we have to say: no, I can't accept that, or yes, go ahead, I want to live at any price. In our case, we have not adopted a firm and definitive position on GMOs, but we are requesting a moratorium while awaiting more definitive results on the experiments being carried out. We are in no way resistant to progress, but we want certainty concerning the absence of danger - certainty that we do not yet have.