

Glyphosate controversy never about science but rather ‘activist’s war on Big Ag’

. . . [W]hat exactly makes glyphosate such a controversial issue? One must look no further than the . . . unexpected decision by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) to classify glyphosate as “probably carcinogenic to humans” back in March 2015. . . .

IARC’s decision flew in the face of the world’s major advisory . . . bodies – the German BfR . . . , the European Food Safety Authority, the US-EPA, the European Chemicals Agency. . . – stated. . . that glyphosate, as properly used, raises no health concerns.

. . . .

. . . [T]he IARC decision has been . . . used to scupper the renewal processes in Europe. . . The findings of all the aforementioned agencies were. . . dismissed by activists with a standard answer: these bodies are . . . are in the pocket of ‘Big Agri’. But this nonchalant dismissal, without proper evaluation . . . of the evidence at hand, contradicts the very decision-making process.

. . . . 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.

[André Heitz is an agronomist and former international civil servant for the United Nations.]

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](#)