



Beyond the Cancer Train: The Real Case for Sustainable Pest Management

*Buts Kumar Gourav¹, Akhileshwar Vishwakarma², Ajeet Kumar Singh¹ and Pratiksha Dwivedi¹

¹Baba Raghav Das Post Graduate College, Deoria-274001, Uttar Pradesh, India

²ICAR-National Research Centre for Makhana, Darbhanga-846005, Bihar, India

*Corresponding Author's email: mishragourav333@gmail.com

Every night, a train leaves Bathinda station in Punjab carrying cancer patients toward a hospital 325 km away in Bikaner, Rajasthan — a journey so common the train has earned the grim nickname “the Cancer Express”. For over a decade, this train has stood as the emotional centerpiece of a narrative linking Punjab’s intensive pesticide use to a regional cancer crisis. This article examines what is scientifically established about pesticide exposure and cancer risk, what remains genuinely contested, and why the case for sustainable, integrated pest management (IPM) does not depend on resolving that debate. Drawing on WHO/IARC hazard classifications, contamination studies, and peer-reviewed field trials of IPM in Punjab, it argues that documented harms to water, soil, and farmer livelihoods already justify a shift away from chemical-intensive agriculture — regardless of how the cancer-causation question is ultimately settled.

Keywords: Cancer Train; Punjab; pesticides; sustainable agriculture; Integrated Pest Management (IPM); IARC; public health; Green Revolution

Introduction

At 9:30 pm each night, a poorly lit, 12-coach train pulls out of Bathinda station carrying passengers of all ages, most clutching folders of medical documents (Chowdhury, 2024a). Roughly a third of its 300 nightly passengers are bound for the Acharya Tulsi Regional Cancer Hospital in Bikaner, arriving around six the following morning (Chowdhury, 2024a). What conductors once called the “TB train,” after the tuberculosis patients who rode it a generation ago, is now widely known as the “Cancer Express” (Al Jazeera, 2015).

The train has become a powerful symbol in Indian environmental journalism — visual, human, and immediate proof, in the popular imagination, that Punjab’s agriculture is poisoning its own people (Al Jazeera, 2015; Chowdhury, 2024b). That story deserves to be told. But if it is meant to drive real policy change rather than just provoke alarm, it also deserves to be told with scientific precision: stating clearly what is proven, what is probable, and what remains disputed, while keeping the undeniable harms of chemical-intensive farming in view.

The Immediate Cause: A Healthcare Access Gap

Part of what created the “cancer train” has less to do with disease origin than with health economics. Bikaner’s hospitals fall under Punjab’s Mukh Mantri Cancer Raahat Kosh scheme, which offers financial assistance of up to ₹15 lakh — support that is markedly harder to access for treatment within Punjab itself (Chowdhury, 2024a; FoodManifest, 2024). In other words, the train is partly a symptom of a policy failure in Punjab’s own healthcare infrastructure, independent of whatever is ultimately driving the underlying disease burden.

What the Science Actually Says About Pesticides and Cancer

A responsible account of this issue must be precise here: the honest scientific answer is “probable for some chemicals, not proven — and highly dependent on which pesticide and how much exposure.”

The World Health Organization’s International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) reviewed five widely used organophosphate pesticides in 2015. It classified the herbicide glyphosate and the insecticides malathion and diazinon as “probably carcinogenic to humans” (Group 2A), and classified tetrachlorvinphos and parathion as “possibly carcinogenic” (Group 2B) (IARC, 2015a; IARC, 2015b). For malathion and diazinon specifically, IARC cited limited human evidence linking exposure to non-Hodgkin lymphoma (IARC, 2015b). Crucially, IARC’s own language describes “limited evidence in humans” combined with “sufficient evidence in animals” — a hazard classification indicating potential to cause cancer, not a confirmed, quantified verdict on real-world risk at typical exposure levels (IARC, 2015a; Tarazona et al., 2017). Other regulatory bodies, including the European Food Safety Authority and the US EPA, have reviewed overlapping evidence and reached less alarming conclusions for glyphosate in particular — which is precisely why this remains a live scientific dispute rather than settled fact (Tarazona et al., 2017; Tarone, 2016).

What is not disputed is that Punjab uses more pesticide per hectare than nearly any other Indian state, a legacy of the Green Revolution’s chemical-intensive push for yield beginning in the 1960s (The Wire, 2024; Al Jazeera, 2015). Nor is it disputed that these chemicals accumulate in bodies that never directly handled them: recent testing found pesticide residues in the breastmilk of lactating mothers in Haryana, and nearly 7% of cow’s-milk samples from Ludhiana exceeded safe pesticide limits (Deccan Herald, 2024). Earlier testing found the banned pesticide DDT and the industrial byproduct BHC in the region’s canal-fed drinking water (Sharma, 2008).

A fair account must also include the genuine counter-narrative. Using Right to Information data obtained from the Bikaner hospital itself, an industry-aligned analysis has argued that the “cancer train” story is overstated, noting that in a national Global Burden of Disease study, Punjab ranks only 24th among Indian states for age-standardized cancer incidence — with several northeastern states that do not practice intensive farming ranking higher (Global Agriculture, 2025). That source carries an evident conflict of interest, originating from a crop-protection industry advisor, and should not be treated as the final word either. But it is a useful corrective: a single train, however powerful as an image, is not epidemiological proof of causation.

Why Sustainable Pest Management Matters Regardless

This is the pivot that gives the issue its “beyond crop protection” significance: the case for sustainable pest management does not require the cancer-causation debate to be fully resolved. Punjab’s pesticide-intensive model carries harms that are already well documented on their own terms.

Water and food contamination. Independent of any cancer verdict, pesticide residues detected in breastmilk, milk supply, and drinking water represent a public-health concern in their own right (Deccan Herald, 2024; Sharma, 2008).

Degrading soil and water tables. Decades of chemical-intensive, water-hungry cropping — particularly paddy cultivation following the Green Revolution — have measurably degraded groundwater and soil health in precisely the districts most associated with the so-called “cancer belt” (The Wire, 2024).

Farmer debt cycles. Heavy reliance on purchased chemical inputs raises production costs and contributes to cycles of debt among smallholder farmers, a well-documented socioeconomic burden independent of health outcomes.

Pest resistance. Decades of calendar-based, blanket spraying have bred resistance in major cotton pests such as the bollworm, forcing farmers to spray more frequently for diminishing

protection — a self-defeating spiral entomologists have tracked since the 1990s (IPM World Textbook, n.d.).

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) offers a tested alternative to this cycle. Rather than spraying on a fixed schedule, IPM applies insecticides only once pest populations cross a measured economic threshold, and relies on resistant crop varieties, natural predators, and selective chemistry to reduce chemical dependence (IPM World Textbook, n.d.; Dhawan et al., 2009). Fifteen-year field trials conducted through Punjab Agricultural University found that IPM adoption cut insecticide sprays by roughly 74% for sucking pests and 12% for bollworms in cotton, without sacrificing yield (IPM World Textbook, n.d.). A separate Insecticide Resistance Management–IPM programme spanning 28 districts across ten Indian states showed comparable reductions in chemical load (Sharma & Ali, 2009). IPM is not a silver bullet: India's decades-long experience with farmer field school programmes has produced mixed, inconsistent results once external funding and training support are withdrawn (Peshin et al., 2022). But it remains the only approach with a substantiated, peer-reviewed track record of reducing pesticide loads at the field level.

Conclusion

The cancer train is real, and the suffering it carries is real. Whether pesticides are the dominant cause of that suffering, however, remains a genuine point of scientific contention, actively debated by researchers on both sides who do not all share a stake in the crop-protection industry. What is not contested is that Punjab's chemical-intensive farming model pollutes its water, degrades its soil, breeds resistant pests, and traps farmers in expensive input cycles — harms that sustainable pest management can measurably reduce, starting now, without waiting for the cancer-causation question to be conclusively resolved. Reframed this way, integrated pest management is not merely an agricultural footnote; it is public health policy operating under a farmer's mandate.

A note on sensitivity: cancer causation from environmental exposure is scientifically complex and rarely reduces to a single cause. This article distinguishes between what regulatory science has established (pesticide contamination of water and food; IARC's hazard classifications for specific chemicals) and what remains genuinely disputed (the precise share of Punjab's cancer burden attributable to pesticide exposure versus other factors). Readers personally affected by a cancer diagnosis should consult an oncologist or genetic counselor rather than draw individual conclusions from population-level environmental data.

References

1. Al Jazeera. (2015). *On the 'Cancer Train' of India's pesticides*. <https://www.aljazeera.com/amp/features/2015/1/9/on-the-cancer-train-of-indias-pesticides>
2. Chowdhury, A. (2024a). *Punjab's 'Cancer Train' Runs on Hope*. The Diplomat. <https://thediplomat.com/2024/10/punjab-cancer-train-runs-on-hope/>
3. Chowdhury, A. (2024b). *Punjab's 'Cancer Train' Runs on Hope*. CodeBlue. <https://codeblue.galencentre.org/2024/10/punjab-cancer-train-runs-on-hope/>
4. Deccan Herald. (2024). *Bathinda-Bikaner 'cancer' train and role of pesticides in agriculture*. <https://www.deccanherald.com/opinion/bathinda-bikaner-cancer-train-and-role-of-pesticides-in-agriculture-3229827>
5. Dhawan, A. K., Singh, S., & Kumar, S. (2009). *Integrated pest management (IPM) helps reduce pesticide load in cotton*. Department of Entomology, Punjab Agricultural University. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281188213_Integrated_pest_management_IPM_helps_reduce_pesticide_load_in_cotton
6. FoodManifest. (2024). *Punjab's Cancer Train: The Impact of Pesticides on Health and Treatment Access*. <https://foodmanifest.com/punjab-cancer-train-the-impact-of-pesticides-on-health-and-treatment-access/>

7. Global Agriculture. (2025). *Breaking the Myth of Punjab's 'Cancer Train'*. <https://www.global-agriculture.com/india-region/breaking-the-myth-of-punjab-cancer-train/>
8. IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer). (2015a). *IARC Monograph on Glyphosate*. World Health Organization. <https://www.iarc.who.int/featured-news/media-centre-iarc-news-glyphosate/>
9. IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer). (2015b). *IARC Monographs Volume 112: Evaluation of Five Organophosphate Insecticides and Herbicides*. World Health Organization. <https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/MonographVolume112-1.pdf>
10. IPM World Textbook. (n.d.). *Integrated Pest Management of Cotton in Punjab, India*. University of Minnesota, Radcliffe's IPM World Textbook. <https://ipmworld.umn.edu/arora>
11. Peshin, R., Sharma, R., & Kumar, R. (2022). *Impact of integrated pest management farmer field school programs in the subtropics of Jammu and Kashmir, India*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/362881034_Impact_of_integrated_pest_management_farmer_field_school_programs_in_the_subtropics_of_Jammu_and_Kashmir_India
12. Sharma, S. P. (2008). *Cancer belt of Punjab*. The Tribune. <https://www.tribuneindia.com/2008/20080309/spectrum/society.htm>
13. Sharma, R., & Ali, F. (2009). Evaluation of the benefits of an insecticide resistance management programme in Punjab in India. *International Journal of Pest Management*, 55(3), 207–220. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09670870902738786>
14. Tarazona, J. V., Court-Marques, D., Tiramani, M., Reich, H., Pfeil, R., Istace, F., & Crivellente, F. (2017). Glyphosate toxicity and carcinogenicity: a review of the scientific basis of the European Union assessment and its differences with IARC. *Archives of Toxicology*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5515989/>
15. Tarone, R. E. (2016). On the International Agency for Research on Cancer classification of glyphosate as a probable human carcinogen. *European Journal of Cancer Prevention*. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27552246/>
16. The Wire. (2024). *Punjab's 'Cancer Train' Is a Grim Reminder of the Role of Agricultural Chemicals*. <https://m.thewire.in/article/health/punjab-cancer-train-is-a-grim-reminder-of-the-role-of-agricultural-chemicals>