

## Infographic: Understanding ‘hazard vs risk’ illustrates lack of science behind IARC’s glyphosate cancer designation

Lately in the news of agriculture there has been a lot of controversy over the popular herbicide glyphosate being labeled as a carcinogen in California. According to peer-reviewed science and dozens of independent science, agriculture and health agencies it is not a carcinogen — with the lone exception of IARC (International Agency on Cancer Research), a sub agency of the World Health Organization, which labeled it as a class 2A “possible carcinogen.” But should this be cause for concern?

As I’ve previously written about [here](#), the IARC measures hazards, not risks. They claim pretty much everything causes cancer—fishing poles, Disneyland, the sun and sunscreen, breathing air, drinking beer, eating bacon, playing cards, etc.

...

Of course, the topic of cancer should never be taken lightly. But when every other agency claims glyphosate is in fact not carcinogenic to humans, one has to raise a skeptical eyebrow to the IARC.

# HAZARD VS. RISK

IARC recently began reviewing pesticides for carcinogenicity. But where IARC assesses potential cancer hazards, regulatory agencies around the world assess cancer risks. In light of this, it's important to understand the difference between hazard and risk.

## HAZARD

Something with the potential to cause harm.



DRIVING ON A ROAD



SHAVING YOUR FACE



USING A BLOW DRYER

VS.

## RISK

The chance you will be harmed.



DRIVING IN A BLIZZARD.



SHAVING A BEAR



USING IT IN THE TUB

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion, and analysis. Read full, original post: [Farm Babe: Glyphosate is a carcinogen? Says who?](#)