

GMOs: “Frankenfood” or “better living through chemistry?”

GMO's are a touchy topic, mostly because of the affiliations of the people who do the arguing. People who have a say in the issue are usually locavores/environmentalists/foodies who place a lot of importance on food purity or people who like to defend industry and markets.

An ideological bloodbath usually ensues whenever they get down and dirty. So where does the truth lie?

This might be an unpopular opinion, but I think people who are highly skeptical of GMO's are more or less in the wrong. The opposition to GMO's suffers from a poor understanding of what the technology is and isn't, an underestimation of their benefits and the problems facing the global food supply, an underestimation of the feasibility and implementation costs of entirely organic farming, and they employ a biased risk assessment of GMO's that makes them unnecessarily alarmist and causes them to mix up their devils.

View the original article here: [GMOs: “Frankenfood” or “Better Living Through Chemistry?”](#)