

What others are saying: Third party responses to IARC Glyphosate Classification 03.30.15 to 04.08.15

Independent expert opinions

[IARC's ruling on glyphosate ignores the science](#) American Council on Science and Health 3.23.2015

Dr. Gil Ross | American Council on Science and Health

“We here at ACSH have been keen observers of the working of IARC over the years, and while this ruling is disappointing for anyone devoted to sound science as the basis of regulatory policy, no one should be surprised. This agency of the WHO/UN is among the worst of the hyper-regulators, and has developed a well-deserved reputation for breezing past or simply ignoring the latest (or even the consensus) science in the service of their precautionary principle-based agenda.”

[Fear Obscuring Science in Herbicide Debate](#) The Hill 04.08.2015

Bill Banner, MD, PhD | president-elect of American Association of Poison Control Centers

“It’s unfortunate that misinformation is once again putting science on the defensive. A rational assessment of risk clearly shows that the risk of lower crop yields needed to feed hungry people far outweighs any risk from glyphosate-resistant or other GMO crops. We have seen the damage that irrational fear can do. I can only hope we have learned our lesson and won’t let history repeat itself.”

[Controversial WHO Report Links Roundup’s Active Ingredient To Cancer](#) CBS Sacramento 3.23.2015

CEO Renee Pinel | Western Plant Health Association

“I think it is either politically-motivated, or it is an organization looking for a headline” She recommends against people not using the chemical. She criticized the study, arguing glyphosate has been widely studied for decades, and accepted as safe by organizations such as the Environmental Protection Agency. “Pretty much everyone uses it. I use it and will continue to use it, and I would highly recommend that anyone currently using it, as long as you read the label and follow directions, you are safe,” she said.

[The Defense of Glyphosate Herbicide](#) The Dr. Oz Show 04.06.15

Dr. Michael Greenberg, MPH | Professor of Emergency Medicine and Chief, Division of Medical Toxicology at Drexel University College of Medicine

“The weight of evidence strongly suggests that glyphosate does not cause cancer – and if it does, a look at the dose demonstrates a lack of medically significant exposure. Users and the public can be confident that labeled uses of glyphosate products pose no meaningful risk of cancer.”

[GMOs are still the best thing for feeding the world](#) Scientific American 03.31.15

Kevin Bonham, Curriculum Fellow | Harvard Medical School (Twitter @Kevbonham)

“Hypothetically, let’s pretend we could say for certain that glyphosate causes cancer. Would this be sufficient reason to stop using glyphosate? Would this imply that GMO’s are a bad idea? The answer to both of these questions is no.”

[What does “Probably Causes Cancer” actually mean?](#) A video explanation on Grist 03.27.15

University of Michigan’s Risk Science Center

[Roundup® a Carcinogen? Never Mind the Science...](#)The Innovation files 3.23.2015

Val Giddings | Senior Fellow, Information Technology and Innovation Foundation

“The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) has departed from the scientific consensus to declare glyphosate, the active ingredient in Roundup®, to be a class 2A “probable human carcinogen”. This contradicts a strong and long standing consensus supported by a vast array of data. The IARC statement is not the result of a thorough, considered and critical review of all the relevant data.

“This conclusion, published in The Lancet Oncology, contradicts a strong and long standing consensus supported by a vast array of data and real world experience, and comes from an organization that rarely addresses potential pesticide carcinogenicity, perhaps because the real concerns in this area are [minimal, and lie elsewhere](#).

“Scientific experts who have considered the body of relevant research do not agree with a categorization of glyphosate as carcinogenic for a very simple reason – it’s clearly not. There is nothing in the data to support such claims, and nothing in the deep reservoir of real world experience with glyphosate, to justify such a move. IARC did not consider any new research or data, and all the information they considered has already been evaluated by regulatory bodies around the world. The most recent of these reviews was conducted by [Germany](#) on behalf of the European Union.

[Expert Reaction to Carcinogenicity classification of five pesticides by the International Agency for Research on Cancer \(IARC\)](#), Science Media Centre 3.20.2015

Prof. Alan Boobis | Professor of Biochemical Pharmacology at Imperial College London

“The IARC process is not designed to take into account how a pesticide is used in the real world – generally there is no requirement to establish a specific mode of action, nor does mode of action influence the conclusion or classification category for carcinogenicity.

“The IARC process is not a risk assessment. It determines the potential for a compound to cause cancer, but not the likelihood.

“The UK Committee on Carcinogenicity has evaluated possible links between pesticide exposure and cancer on several occasions. It has found little evidence for such a link. At most, the evidence was inconsistent and was considered insufficient to call for regulatory action.

“These conclusions of IARC are important and should be taken into account when evaluating these pesticides, but that must also take into account how the pesticides are used in the real world. In my view this report is not a cause for undue alarm.

Prof. Sir Colin Berry | Emeritus Professor of Pathology at Queen Mary University of London

“I have served on a number of regulatory bodies for the UK, EU and WHO and I am well used to sifting wheat from chaff in the analysis of pesticides. What is missing in this new assessment is balance in the consideration of the studies.

“There are over 60 genotoxicity studies on glyphosate with none showing results that should cause alarm relating to any likely human exposure. For human epidemiological studies there are 7 cohort and 14 case control studies, none of which support carcinogenicity.

“The weight of evidence is against carcinogenicity.

“This assessment has looked at a group of 43 diseases lumped into one category, multiple pesticides with very different chemistry, and has failed to include critical data. There is nothing here to suggest that the variety of genetic changes in these diseases could be caused by these pesticides. This appears to be a rather selective review.”

Prof. David Coggon | Professor of Occupational and Environmental Medicine at the University of Southampton

“Given the large number of epidemiological studies that have been carried out on pesticides and cancer, many of them looking at multiple types of malignancy, it is to be expected that some positive associations will occur simply by chance. Thus, when evaluating the epidemiological evidence, one is looking for a consistent pattern of increased risk for one or more tumour types, which is unlikely to be explained by biases (often unavoidable) in the study methods. It is clear from the summary table in the Lancet report that clear and consistent evidence of this type was not found for any of the pesticides that were considered. Regulatory risk assessment for pesticides, both in the EU and the USA, routinely considers evidence on potential carcinogenicity, both from animal studies (including some that may not have been published in the peer-reviewed literature, but which have been conducted to specified exacting standards) and also, where available, from epidemiological research. The approach adopted is precautionary. Where there are any indications that a compound might cause cancer, it will not be approved for use unless there is good evidence that it is not genotoxic and that no risk of cancer would occur from the levels of exposure that could occur in a worst case scenario. Risk assessments are reviewed periodically, and particularly if new evidence emerges to suggest a previously unrecognised problem.

Prof. Tony Dayan | Emeritus Toxicologist

“Detailed analysis of the nature and quality of the evidence overall does not support such a high level classification, which at the most should be Class IIB.

[March Madness From the United Nations](#), Forbes 3.20.2015

Henry Miller | Forbes Science and Technology contributor

The data (and a selected set of data, at that) were reviewed to determine whether glyphosate is capable of causing cancer. As with common chemicals like sugar, salt and water, and foods like nutmeg and licorice, glyphosate at very high doses is capable of causing harm to humans. That’s what the IARC “2A” designation—“probably carcinogenic to humans”—essentially means. But one of the seminal tenets of toxicology is that “the dose makes the poison,” and the reality is that glyphosate is not a human health risk even at levels of exposure that are more than 100 times higher than the human exposures that occur under conditions consistent with the product’s labeling.

[Letter to Chair of U.S. House Committee on Agriculture](#) Agri-Pulse 04.01.15

Dr. Nina Fedoroff | Senior science advisor of OFW Law and member of the National Academy of Sciences

“Furthermore, the IARC’s recent conclusions appear to be the result of an incomplete data review that has omitted key evidence, and so needs to be treated with a significant degree of caution, particularly in light of the wealth of independent evidence demonstrating the safety of glyphosate.”

[Glyphosate and Cancer: What Does the Data Say](#) Weed Control Freaks 03.28.15

Andrew Kniss, University of Wyoming

“... based on the data I could find, I don’t see any evidence for alarm. And I say that as someone who is exposed to more glyphosate than a vast majority of the population.”

Regulatory Statements

The German Risk Agency (BfR): [Does glyphosate cause cancer?](#)

“As the ‘Rapporteur Member State’ for the active substance glyphosate within the framework of EU re-evaluation, the Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR) was responsible for the human health risk assessment and has assessed glyphosate as non-carcinogenic.”

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA): [CropLife Magazine](#) 04.06.15

Carissa Cyran | Chemical review manager for the Office of Pesticide Programs at EPA

“Our review concluded that this body of research does not provide evidence to show that glyphosate causes cancer, and it does not warrant any change in EPA’s cancer classification for glyphosate. This is the same conclusion reached in 2004 by the United Nations’ Food and Agriculture Organization and affirmed this year by Germany’s pesticide regulatory officials. In a few months, EPA will be releasing for public comment our preliminary human health risk assessment for glyphosate as part of our research program to re-evaluate all pesticides periodically. EPA is aware of the recent IARC report and will address it in detail in the preliminary risk assessment.”

Industry Statements

Truth About Trade & Technology [Using Glyphosate Politics to Scare People Is Wrong](#)

Chairman Bill Horan 04.02.15 (Twitter: @TruthAboutTrade and @World_Farmers)

“Using glyphosate politics to scare people is wrong ... studies consistently show that glyphosate is safe, even when exposure exceeds recommended levels by factors of more than 100.”

National Council for Air and Stream Improvement ([NCASI](#))

“It should also be noted that the IARC evaluation seeks only to address the question of whether it is possible, under some set of circumstances, for an agent to be carcinogenic. It is not an assessment of risks and does not address the question of whether an agent is likely to be carcinogenic under realistic or feasible circumstances.”

RISE (Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment): [RISE issues statement on IARC’s glyphosate rating](#)

This rating doesn’t support other agencies’ science intensive determinations, including the EPA or other leading nations’ regulatory findings,” says RISE President Aaron Hobbs. “U.S. EPA’s regulatory system ensures every pesticide product enters the market only when its safety has been assured.

European Crop Protection Association: [ECPA Statement Reacting to IARC Review of Pesticides](#)

The IARC conclusions published in Lancet Oncology contradict the world’s most robust and stringent regulatory systems – namely the European Union and the United States – in which crop protection products have undergone extensive reviews based on multi-year testing and in which active ingredients such as glyphosate and malathion been found not to present a carcinogenic risk to humans.

American Soybean Association: [Soy Growers: IARC Reclassification at Odds with Scientific Consensus on Safety of Glyphosate](#)

Soybean farmers are concerned first and foremost about the safety of their employees, their customers and neighbors in their communities, which is why this notification from the IARC is so

confounding. From the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to its counterparts in Germany, Australia, Canada and elsewhere, we've seen risk assessment and safety agencies confirm the safety of glyphosate herbicide.

CropLife International: [Statement on IARC's Carcinogenic Review of Crop Protection Products](#)

The IARC conclusions published in the Lancet Oncology contradict the world's most robust regulatory systems – namely the European Union and the United States – where crop protection products have undergone extensive reviews based on multi-year testing and where active ingredients such as glyphosate and malathion been found not to present a carcinogenic risk to humans. CropLife International believes that IARC has made its conclusions as a result of an incomplete data review where key evidence has been omitted.

National Corn Growers Association: [NCGA Denounces IARC Glyphosate Reclassification, Urges Prompt Reconsideration](#)

“It is irresponsible to reclassify glyphosate in such a capricious manner as this decision both creates panic and has the potential to impact access to one of farmers' main methods of combating weeds. While glyphosate is one of the most studied, trusted crop protection products available today, it is under political attack currently, and it is possible this impacted IARC's decision.

Glyphosate Task Force: [Statement of the GTF on the recent IARC decision concerning glyphosate](#)

Evaluations carried out by regulatory authorities across the world for over forty years have all confirmed that glyphosate poses no unacceptable risk to humans, animals or the environment. The Glyphosate Task Force (GTF) therefore does not accept the recent classification of glyphosate by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) as a Group 2A carcinogen.

AGCARM (New Zealand Product Safety): [Keeping Safe When Using Agrichemicals](#)

Users of agrichemicals can be assured that these products are safe ... Agcarm will continue to work with the regulators to ensure every crop protection product goes through proper testing procedure and will only be sold when its safety has been assured.

Crop Protection Association (UK): [CPA statement in response to IARC review of pesticides](#)

It's extremely surprising that the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) has apparently disregarded a substantial body of scientific evidence supporting the conclusion that glyphosate is not a human health risk.

CropLife Australia: IARC deliver confusing and unconstructive list of potential carcinogens

Every agricultural chemical product registered in Australia goes through a thorough scientific, evidence-based risk assessment, which assess any hazards associated with the product and determines the relevant risks to users, consumers and the environment. This process is far more scientifically rigorous than that carried out by the IARC.”

Albaugh LLC Formulator and packager of agrochemical products.

Through its continued participation in these [glyphosate] task forces, Albaugh will work to urge the withdrawal of the finding of the IARC with respect to glyphosate (not available online)

National Association of Wheat Growers: [Wheat Growers Express Concern over IARC Glyphosate Reclassification](#)

Consumers can have faith that U.S. farmers and ranchers, including wheat growers, work tirelessly to provide the safest possible food for our families and theirs.

Kansas Agribusiness Retailers Association [Safe Herbicide](#) Kansas City Star 03.30.15

“It’s time to be afraid, but not of glyphosate. I’m afraid of how science is ignored by quasi-government organizations such as the International Agency for Research on Cancer. When regulatory bodies across the world have reviewed glyphosate, they’ve all reached the same conclusion. It is not carcinogenic.”