

IARC accused of selectively excluding 'best' scientists from glyphosate review

To scientists... what was really alarming was [the IARC] finding that the pesticide glyphosate, the main ingredient in the common product Roundup, was reclassified as 2A, "probably carcinogenic to humans."

....

When the glyphosate claim first came out, there was confusion... IARC was in defiance of every scientific body for decades. Then it was discovered there was a reason they were so wacky. The corresponding author, Christopher Portier, was an "Invited Specialist" for the IARC Monograph 112 Working Group even though he worked for the anti-science Environmental Defense Fund... In recent years, unlike the original IARC, which wanted the best scientists, the modern version specifically excluded anyone who had ever consulted for industry, even though 100 percent of applied science is done by corporations and 60 percent of basic research is. Yet they don't exclude consultants for environmental groups...

...[B]locking out the best scientists in order to only leave the ones who match an ideological litmus test ended up causing the exact problem scientists feared it would. [*Writing in the European Journal of Cancer Prevention*](#), Robert Tarone... exposed how IARC not only cherry-picked the studies to include, it... cherry-picked data from within those studies...

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: [‘Of Questionable Evidentiary Weight’ — Another Nail In IARC's Glyphosate Coffin](#)