

## When the anti-GE science sucks, you can have it both ways

*The following is an edited excerpt.*

Dear Howard Vleiger, which one is correct?

You have stood by your (probably bogus) data from the “Stunning Corn Comparison” on Moms Across America. Here GMO corn is compared to conventional corn– but the GMO corn, by your data, has no nutritional value and is full of formaldehyde and glyphosate. Everyone in the anti-GM world stands by these data as valid (even though they are adulterated soil data– we don’t do those tests on biological matter).

Now, you are second author on the “GM is bad for pig stomachs” study (Carman et al, 2013, Journal of Something Obscure). In this study it is stated in Materials and Methods on page 41:

“The GM soy and corn used in this study have been determined to be compositionally and substantially equivalent to non-GM varieties of soy and corn ... which indicates that there should be no phenotypical variation between the GM and non-GM varieties used in this study that could influence the outcomes measured in this study.

Wait a minute! How can GM corn be full of formaldehyde and glyphosate, have no carbon in it and 1% Brix (none of which are close to reality) and be called “compositionally and substantially equivalent” to conventional corn?

**Read the full post here: [When the Science Sucks, You Can Have it Both Ways!](#)**