Invited commentary

Apart from the authors’ highlights on the environmental impacts of tobacco production, additional problems include farmers smoking raw tobacco, which leaves the majority of them sick; for example, more than 75% of tobacco farmers in Tanzania smoke raw tobacco. Farmers also die in curing barns due to carbon monoxide poisoning. Increased tobacco farming due to industry sensitisation has resulted in increased labour demands with people engaging in human trafficking; for example, in Tanzania, people sold to big farmers for between US $40 million is spent to treat tobacco-related cancers alone. Environmentally, tobacco farming is responsible for causing more than 4% of the desert area in Tanzania and, Umombo, one of the major tobacco growing districts, lost about 1.5 million trees worth more than US$10.5 million in 2010/2011 alone. Tobacco companies also lie in claiming that farmers have no economically viable alternative crops. In Tanzania, more than 70% of tobacco farmers interviewed preferred alternative crops which they also identified; their only worry was sustainable markets for such crops.

Apart from further research to quantify the health impacts of tobacco farming and evaluate potential alternative crops, collaboration at national, regional and global levels is necessary to strategise on how best to counter the emerging solidarity among tobacco companies that are working towards paralysing tobacco control efforts, particularly in low- and middle-income countries.
Educating and sensitising government and other leaders and supporting tobacco farmers through the process of adopting alternative crops while securing sustainable markets will enhance environmental health sustainability efforts.

Lutgard Kokulinda Kagaruki

Correspondence to Lutgard K Kagaruki, Tanzania Tobacco Control Forum, Plot 677 Sinza A, Sam Nujoma/Igesa Rd. Opp Kobil Petrol St, P. O. Box 33105, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; info@ttcf.or.tz

Funding Studies in Tanzania were funded in part by the Foundation Umverteilen and the Union for International Cancer Control.

Competing interests None.

Provenance and peer review Commissioned; internally peer reviewed.

REFERENCES