Health Care Without Harm opposes the use of recombinant Bovine Growth Hormone, (rBGH or rBST), a synthetic hormone given to dairy cows to increase milk production, due to its adverse impacts on animals and potential harm to humans. We therefore encourage health care providers to purchase non-rBGH milk from suppliers. Moreover, we encourage them to source from dairies that demonstrate a strong commitment to alternatives to non-essential hormones and antibiotics, and that support local farmers and sustainable practices.

Background on rBGH
Introduced into dairy production in the United States in 1993, rBGH is a genetically engineered animal drug injected into cows to increase their milk production. After a cow calves, she produces milk for about twelve weeks, after which milk production tapers down, feed intake catches up, and her body rebuilds. By injecting or implanting rBGH, a producer can postpone that crossover point for another 8 to 12 weeks and keep milk production at a high level for a longer period of time.1

Though approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), rBGH has adverse impacts on animal health and human health concerns about the use of rBGH remain unresolved. Consumers Union, the nation's largest consumer organization, has called on the FDA to reassess its approval of rBGH. Most industrialized nations of the world do not allow the use of rBGH in dairy production based primarily on animal and human health concerns. These include Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and all 25 nations of the European Union.

Human Health Concerns
Antibiotic Resistance: Cows injected with rBGH suffer increased rates of udder infection (mastitis) and other health issues, forcing farmers to increase their use of therapeutic antibiotics including important human antibiotics.2 Antibiotic use in food animals contributes to antibiotic resistance transmitted to humans. More generally, the increased use of antibiotics in animals has contributed to the global crisis of antibiotic-resistant infections in humans.4 Pasteurization kills 97-99% of bacteria in milk. The remaining bacteria may include drug-resistant strains. The National Academy of Sciences has stated that, “Clearly, a decrease in the inappropriate use of antimicrobials in human medicine alone is not enough. Substantial efforts must be made to decrease inappropriate overuse of antimicrobials in animals and agriculture as well.”5

Potential Cancer Risks: IGF-1 is a growth factor present with the same molecular structure in both cows and humans. Use of rBGH increases IGF-1 levels in cows and cows milk. Some evidence from animal studies suggests that most IGF-1 in milk is protected from digestion by casein, milk’s main protein, thereby allowing IGF-1 to enter the bloodstream.6,2,8 It remains unclear whether drinking rBGH milk will contribute to an increase in human blood levels of IGF-1 significantly more than drinking non-rBGH milk or other dietary factors.9,10 If it does there would be concern since elevated IGF-1 in humans is associated with increased rates of colon, breast, and prostate cancer.11

Since rBGH is unnecessary to produce milk, and because there is some scientific basis to presume that milk from rBGH-treated cows indeed might increase human IGF-1 levels, we feel it is prudent to err on the side of avoiding this potential risk.

Immunological Effects of Absorbed rBGH: Low levels of rBGH are present in milk that people drink from rBGH-treated animals. Laboratory animal tests at higher doses indicate that at least some rBGH survives digestion and enters the bloodstream, potentially resulting in antibody production and allergic reactions. In granting approval for use of rBGH/rBST, the FDA relied upon a single toxicological study in animals (a 90-day rat feeding study). Five years after FDA’s approval, a Health Canada scientific review team found “(T)here were no long-term toxicity or reproduction/teratogenicity studies” done on the drug. In fact, as the Canadian scientists reported, “(N)ot only was the orally administered rBST absorbed into the blood stream of these rats but also it produced in them a distinct immunological effect.”12
Health Canada’s report found a specific immunoglobulin response in 20% - 30% of rats fed a moderate or high dose of rBGH, and stated “The human health implications of the immunological findings in rats should have been thoroughly evaluated...the nature of the product should have prompted more exhaustive and longer toxicological studies in laboratory animals.”

Animal Health Concerns

The package insert for rBGH, as required by the FDA, lists 16 different harmful health effects increased in cows receiving it. These include reduced pregnancy rates, lower birth weight of calves, and increased rates of indigestion, diarrhea, somatic cell counts and mastitis. Scientists from the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association stated that “there are a number of legitimate animal welfare concerns associated with the use of rBST,” and recommended against approval. rBGH manufacturer Monsanto, is required in its drug circular for its rBGH/rBST product to state that “Use of POSILAC™ is associated with increased frequency of use of medication in cows for mastitis and other health problems.”

Conclusion

Based on evidence of harm to animals from rBGH and the science raising possible human health concerns, HCWH encourages health care providers to purchase non-rBGH dairy from suppliers. There are two categories of non-rBGH milk, organic and conventional. Organic is available in most parts of the country, usually at higher prices than conventional. Non-rBGH milk, often similarly priced to rBGH milk, may sometimes be labeled as containing “no artificial (or added) hormones”; buyers should ask their dairy suppliers for their policies on availability and verification methods for non-rBGH dairy products.
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