

Food safety shouldn't be defined by activists; GMOs are proven safe

There is little doubt consumers are becoming increasingly concerned about provenance issues regarding the food they consume and whether that food is being produced in an ethical and sustainable way.

However, far too often consumers are allowing activist groups to define 'threats' to the community's wellbeing, claiming they are the only parties with sufficient independence to enlighten all and sundry.

Truth is not the ally of activists, who operate within the paradigm that near enough is good enough.

Why present facts when half-truths, suppositions and smears are far more effective in getting their jaundiced message across?

Last year, researchers from the University of California, Davis went a long way towards allaying community concerns in relation to the safety of GM.

They published a groundbreaking study into the health of U.S. livestock straddling the period pre and post-introduction of GM animal feed in 1996.

In summary, the study found that there were no unusual trends in the health of animals since GM feed was introduced. That is, GM feed is just as safe as non-GM feed.

A data set of this magnitude means that the debate as to whether GM is safe is a done deal.

In other words, the flat-earthers can pack up their bat and ball and head home.

But the most galling aspect of the fear and scorn foisted on GM advancements and technology is the myopic, first-world prism that critics view the world through.

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the variety of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: Stand tall on your GM choices