The Science of the Endocrine Disrupter Debate explains the absence of science

By ACSH Staff — January 21, 2015

In the recent *Independent Women’s Forum*[^1], CEI’s Angela Logomasini dissects the hype from the facts about so-called endocrine disrupting chemicals. She points out (as we here at ACSH have been [saying for years](https://www.acsh.org/news/2015/01/21/science-endocrine-disrupter-debate-explains-absence-of-science) that the term itself has no real scientific or medical meaning, outside of its repeated (emphatic) use by those with an anti-chemical agenda and their pals in the media.

She further notes that the pervasive activist campaigns against EDCs (endocrine-disrupting chemicals) are a huge drag on our economy. Furthermore, these result in exposing consumers to second- and third-rate products, if corporations cave in to artificially-generated consumer concern and reformulate their products to eliminate long-used, safe and cheap chemicals with unknown substitutes to ameliorate the loudmouths. BPA, triclosan, phthalates, and various personal care products have all come under junk-science-based attacks.

However, an [objective study](https://www.acsh.org/news/2015/01/21/science-endocrine-disrupter-debate-explains-absence-of-science) by several academics with no ties to industry revealed their assessment of EDC risk thusly: Overall, despite of 20 years of research, a human health risk from exposure to low concentrations of exogenous chemical substances with weak hormone-like activities remains an unproven and unlikely hypothesis.

ACSH’s Dr. Gil Ross had this comment: Whenever I hear someone, usually in the media, use the term endocrine disrupter, I immediately know that the writer (or speaker) is either uninformed and too lazy to do a little independent research, or is a member of or a sympathizer with some anti-chemical activist group. We in the business of communicating real vs. hypothetical risks owe Angela a debt of gratitude for attempting to put this mythology to rest, although realistically too many people, in and out of government and regulatory agencies, have a vested interest in keeping the endo-disruption bugaboo alive. Also, those interested in sound science should have a peek at Angela’s other site, SafeChemicalPolicy.org.
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