



**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:  
June 2, 2011**

Contact: Ben Somberg, 202.658.8129  
bsomberg@progressivereform.org

## **CPR White Paper Explodes Industry Myths about BPA;**

### ***Five Myths Intended to Muddle Facts, Cast False Doubt on Sound Science about BPA's Dangers***

Washington, DC ---- In the face of mounting evidence of the health dangers of bisphenol A (BPA), industry has mounted a defense of the substance that rests on a number of disproved myths, according to a new white paper issued today by the Center for Progressive Reform.

BPA is a compound used in the manufacture of polycarbonate plastics and epoxy resins, which are used in a variety of commercial applications, including bottles and can linings. When heated, BPA can leach from the container and into food, where it is subsequently ingested. Once in the body, it can mimic the effect of critical hormones, such as estrogen, triggering biological responses at the wrong time or in damaging ways. Scientists have concluded that the substance disrupts reproduction in animals, and believe it most likely has the same effect in humans.

Despite all the evidence of BPA's danger, plastic manufacturers have mounted a PR and lobbying blitz aimed at obscuring or confusing the results of research. "There's a lot scientists don't know about BPA," says CPR Member Scholar and white paper co-author Thomas McGarity, a law professor at the University of Texas. "But what they know for sure gives ample reason to limit the use of BPA. Simply put, the chemical is ubiquitous in commerce and in Americans' bodies as a result. Rather than seeking to confuse and mislead Americans about BPA, the plastics industry should acknowledge the danger and eliminate it."

One particularly troubling finding of research is that even small exposures can disrupt the human body. Industry, however, has sought to cloud the issue with a series of five myths, each of which are debunked in the new CPR White Paper, [\*Opening the Industry Playbook: Myths and Truths in the Debate Over BPA Regulation\*](#). The myths:

1. **The myth of a scientific consensus on safety:** Industry advocates commonly assert that scientists concur that BPA is safe. In fact, scientists say that BPA is a known endocrine disruptor and that it therefore presents many risks.
2. **The 'Good Laboratory Practices' myth:** Industry activists argue that regulatory agencies should disregard studies that do not comply with FDA's Good Laboratory Practices standard, including many studies that exhibit a link between low-dose BPA exposure and adverse health effects. In so doing, they misapply the GLP standard, which is focused primarily on recordkeeping and maintenance requirements, and is therefore not the best measure of a particular study's scientific validity. It is a mistake to ignore the pioneering work that meets other standards of quality, like robust peer review.

3. **The exposure and metabolism myths:** BPA manufacturers would have us believe that the risk of adverse effects from BPA exposure is insignificant because typical human exposures are low and the chemical is readily metabolized into non-endocrine-disrupting forms. However, strong research shows that BPA's ubiquity leads to such frequent doses that even healthy adults cannot metabolize all of the chemical in their bodies. Infants and fetuses, with their less developed metabolic systems, are at particular risk of adverse health effects.
4. **The economic myths:** BPA manufacturers maintain that the chemical is a key ingredient in safe food packaging, one that cannot be replaced with economical alternatives. In fact, numerous canned food companies have replaced BPA without significant cost problems, and bans on BPA in baby bottles in Japan, China, and in various states in the U.S. have spurred innovation.
5. **The myth of "patchwork" regulation:** The BPA-manufacturing industry complains that lack of uniformity in state-level regulations increases the costs of producing, distributing, and marketing their products. Although a growing coterie of states has banned the sale of certain products with BPA, the truth is that non-regulation of BPA is the norm across the United States. The real purpose of propagating this myth is to move the regulatory debate to the federal level, where large manufacturers' advocates often have a stronger voice than their public interest counterparts.

"Industry's playbook in serving up and perpetuating these myths is borrowed from the years-long campaigns run by the tobacco industry and automobile manufacturers," said McGarity. "They're in the business of creating doubt—reasonable or otherwise—about compelling science they find inconvenient. It's a huge disservice to policymakers and the public, but particularly to children across the nation who will continue to be exposed needlessly to a substance that could do them considerable and lasting harm."

The authors recommend that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and the National Institutes of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) and Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) step up efforts to coordinate their work. The report also calls on Congress to improve the federal approach to toxics regulations by affirmatively empowering agencies like the EPA, FDA, CPSC, and OSHA to regulate endocrine-disrupting compounds.

McGarity's co-authors on the report are CPR President and Member Scholar Rena Steinzor (University of Maryland law professor), CPR Senior Policy Analyst Matthew Shudtz, and CPR Policy Analyst Lena Pons.

*The Center for Progressive Reform (www.progressivereform.org) is a nonprofit research and educational organization dedicated to protecting health, safety, and the environment through analysis and commentary. Visit CPR on the web at www.progressivereform.org and read CPRBlog at www.progressivereform.org/cprblog.*

###

The report is available online at [http://www.progressivereform.org/articles/BPA\\_Myths\\_1107.pdf](http://www.progressivereform.org/articles/BPA_Myths_1107.pdf).