

## Viewpoint: Here's how activist scientists use exaggerated fears of trace chemicals as a subterfuge to try to derail crop biotechnology

Environmental Health published on August 3, 2021 "[Commentary: Novel strategies and new tools to curtail the health effects of pesticides](#)" by Charles Benbrook, Melissa J. Perry, Fiorella Belpoggi, Philip J. Landrigan, Michelle Perro, Daniele Mandrioli, Michael N. Antoniou, Paul Winchester and Robin Mesnage.

Here is the summary:

Follow the latest news and policy debates on sustainable agriculture, biomedicine, and other 'disruptive' innovations. Subscribe to our newsletter.

[SIGN UP](#)

Preventing adverse public health effects triggered or exacerbated by exposure to pesticides will require changes in risk assessment policies and procedures, a science freer from industry influence, and innovative strategies that combine traditional methods with new tools and mechanistic knowledge.

It's dripping with good thinking! But these new strategies and these new tools "to limit the effects of pesticides on health" are a fig leaf to hide another objective: that of making the approval of plant protection products almost impossible.

Consider the list of authors.

Lead author Charles Benbrook is a "[scientist for hire](#)", a [paid](#) scientist who works primarily for the organic farming industry and occasionally for Greenpeace.

...

Melissa J. Perry? Involved as an expert in "litigation" on one or more pesticides. It is probably not necessary to dig deeper to know which side.

**[Editor's note: This article was originally published in French and has been translated for clarity.]**

[This is an excerpt. Read the original post here.](#)