

Grist: Does the “little difference” between GE and traditional breeding matter?

Anti-GMO: We know we are making double-stranded DNA with GM. We don't know that it's happening frequently in nature. So we should be more careful.

Pro-GMO: Maybe it does, maybe it doesn't, and it almost certainly doesn't matter. We're almost certainly impervious.

Anti-GMO: But maybe it does — and if so, hoo-boy, we'll all be sorry!

Rise above the details of my imaginary debate for a moment to notice the ground each side has staked out as a presumptive starting place. You have one side that sees humans as fragile and dependent on maintaining the nurturing environment in which they evolved. The other sees humans as tough survivors of a fundamentally chaotic environment.

Read the full story here: [Genetic engineering: Do the differences make a difference?](#)

Additional Resources:

Read the rest of Nathanael Johnson's ongoing series reconsidering genetic engineering at Grist below, and look for future installments to be featured on the GLP:

1. [The genetically modified food debate: Where do we begin?](#)
2. [The GM safety dance: What's rule and what's real](#)
3. [Genetic engineering vs. natural breeding: What's the difference?](#)

Read GLP founder Jon Entine's reaction to Johnson's series here:

- [“Call to action: Grist reevaluates crop biotechnology; It's time the rest of journalism does too,”](#)

Genetic Literacy Project