

GMO controversy 'more cultural than scientific'

Genetically modified organisms, or GMOs, remain controversial, but like so many other politically hot topics, the controversy is more cultural than scientific.

Scientific evidence more than a century ago settled on the consensus that life on earth is the product of organic evolution. Over the last several decades a scientific consensus has emerged that our planet is warming from man-made causes. Over that same time scientists agreed, based upon evidence, that vaccines do not cause autism. Yet all of these topics remain publically controversial. Now, the science seems to be converging on the consensus that GMO crops are safe for the environment and human consumption. Those who have opposed GMO crops are not happy with the science.

It is perfectly reasonable to be suspicious of new powerful technologies, and of the companies who promote and desire to use them. The precautionary principle is valid, requiring rigorous scientific research and thoughtful government regulation, with the goal of allowing humanity to benefit from such technologies while minimizing the risks. A risk versus benefit analysis is therefore most useful. No new technology is without risk, but sometimes opposing innovation has greater risks.

There appears to be a strengthening scientific consensus that GMO crops and animals are safe and useful. As the scientific community starts to more vociferously back such conclusions, political opposition to GMO is heating up. We seem to be heading for a confrontation. As always, we would be best served if the science wins out.

Read the full, original article: [No health concerns for GMO](#)