

What scientific consensus on GMOs actually means

Over and over, I've read comments on the internet (obviously, my first mistake) that there is no scientific consensus about GMOs, or genetically modified organisms (generally crops or food), and their safety to humans and the environment.

There are even claims that GMOs are not necessarily productive or provide higher yields, and so called organic foods are healthier ([they aren't](#)) and can lead to higher productivity

What is a scientific consensus?

A [scientific consensus](#) is the [collective opinion and judgement of scientists in a particular field of study](#), based on the quality and quantity of evidence. This consensus implies general agreement, and disagreement is usually limited and generally insignificant.

The scientific consensus is based on the accrued data, but it has been thoroughly scrutinized by the experts in the field over time. When we talk about the scientific consensus of climate change (or vaccines or GMOs or evolution), these weren't made by a bunch of journalists or baseball players sitting in that room with food and drinks. It's made by literally hundreds or thousands of scientists in that field that have many accumulated years of experience and knowledge.

And let me reiterate—this knowledge doesn't come by hours or days of “research” on Google or reading biased information. If a few thousand geologists, climatologists, and biologists give us a scientific consensus that anthropogenic climate change is real, then that's solid knowledge.

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: [The solid GMO scientific consensus](#)