

Scientists cheer death of Prop 37

Scientists, on the whole, are pleased to see Prop 37 fail this week. This blog post from SciAm explains the faulty science at the base of the proposition nicely. An excerpt:

The simple fact is that there is no evidence that GMOs, as a blanket group, are dangerous. There's a simple reason for this: not all GMOs are the same. Every plant created with genetic technology contains a different modification. More to the point, if the goal is to know more about what's in your food, a generic GMO label won't tell you. Adding [Bt toxin to corn](#) is different than adding [Vitamin A to rice](#) or [vaccines to potatoes](#) or [heart-protective peptides to tomatoes](#). If Prop 37 was really about informed decisions, it would have sought accurate labeling of different types of GMOs so consumers can choose to avoid those that they disapprove of or are worried about. Instead, anti-GMO activists put forward a sloppily written mandate in an attempt to discredit all genetic engineering as a single entity. The legislation was considered so poorly worded that most Californian newspapers rallied against it, with [the LA Times calling Prop 37](#) "problematic on a number of levels".

View the original article here: [Prop 37 Loses, Scientists Cheer](#)