Scientific American: Labels for GMO foods are a bad idea

Scientific American has made a statement denouncing the mandatory labeling of genetically engineered food in response to pending GMO-labeling legislation in nearly half of the US states. Citing concerns over the repercussions of arbitrary labeling—including negating the benefits GMOs have provided to people in developing countries, in addition to unpredictably raising the cost of food domestically—the organization believes that labeling based on unfounded fears will shun an increasingly beneficial and promising technology that is widely considered safe. An excerpt:

For the past 20 years Americans have been eating plants in which scientists have used modern tools to insert a gene here or tweak a gene there, helping the crops tolerate drought and resist herbicides. Around 70 percent of processed foods in the U.S. contain genetically modified ingredients.

Instead of providing people with useful information, mandatory GMO labels would only intensify the misconception that so-called Frankenfoods endanger people's health. The American Association for the Advancement of Science, the World Health Organization and the exceptionally vigilant European Union agree that GMOs are just as safe as other foods. Compared with conventional breeding techniques—which swap giant chunks of DNA between one plant and another—genetic engineering is far more precise and, in most cases, is less likely to produce an unexpected result. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has tested all the GMOs on the market to determine whether they are toxic or allergenic. They are not.

Read the full, original story here: "Labels for GMO Foods Are a Bad Idea"

Additional Resources:

- "AAAS Board of Directors: Legally Mandating GM Food Labels Could 'Mislead and Falsely Alarm Consumers,'" AAAS
- "The genetically modified food debate: Where do we begin?" Grist
- "The GMO Labeling Debate," Discover
- "The Truth about Genetically Modified Food," Scientific American