

## GMO crops: To label or not to label?

This fall, California voters will be asked to vote on Proposition 37, a law which would require that all foods including “GMO Crop ingredients” be labeled as such. There are many reasons that this isn’t a good use of governmental authority for mandatory food labeling. A look at historical logic and precedents for labeling, and at the misleading messages this initiative would foster, should inspire Californians to reject it at the ballot box.

### Labeling for a Known Hazard

If a food is hazardous to some consumers, but not others (e.g. peanut allergy), then it makes sense to require that it be labeled to protect that minority. If a food contains something generally hazardous, but difficult to immediately remove from the food supply, it makes sense to label those foods as well (e.g. trans-fats for which labeling was required after 2006). If a particular GMO crop were to be found to be hazardous to certain people, or people in general, the appropriate response would be to **ban** the use of that particular trait nationally, not to label it at a state level! No such hazard has been documented for dozens of biotech crops over 16 years of extensive commercialization, so “hazard” has never been a reason to require labeling of a GMO crop.

View the original article here: [GMO crops: To label or not to label?](#)