

Viewpoint: IARC's defenders ignore cancer agency's flawed research, conflicts of interest

I woke up to find an [article](#) by Neil Pearce, a professor at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, entitled "Independent, rigorous, vilified – why attacks on the International Agency for Research on Cancer are unfair."

...

The IARC Working Group which reviewed [the herbicide] glyphosate distorted the findings of animal studies, ignoring the consistent absence of increased tumors in rats and mice exposed to increasing doses of the chemical IARC has [also] ignored [rigorous re-analyses](#) of the animal data exposing these improprieties.

.... Pearce – conveniently – ignores the fact that IARC's assessment of glyphosate stands in sharp contrast to the judgment of virtually every other health and regulatory agency. These have found glyphosate to be safe To have pointed out this glaring disagreement with other international and national agencies might have undermined Pearce's desire to attribute any criticism of IARC to pro-industry vested interests.

...

[A] key figure in the Agency's glyphosate assessment has his own glaring conflict-of-interest. In 2014 an American scientist Chris Portier initially proposed that the Agency review glyphosate. He then participated on the glyphosate panel as an outside expert. Then, within weeks of the publication of IARC's glyphosate judgment in March, 2015, Portier became a litigation consultant for two law firms that were bringing lawsuits against Monsanto

Read full, original article: [With Defenders Like These, The International Agency for Research on Cancer Hardly Needs Enemies](#)