

Why we need a 'dispassionate' look at GMOs

Despite myriad assurances from scientists that foods containing genetically modified ingredients are safe to eat, consumers are likely to see more and more products labeled "GMO-free" in the not-too-distant future. As happened with the explosion of gluten-free products, food companies are quick to cash in on what they believe consumers want regardless of whether it is scientifically justified.

Responding to consumer concerns about genetically modified organisms, or GMOs, in foods, as well as individual company and state actions on GMO labeling, the Department of Agriculture last month [announced a voluntary certification program](#) that food companies would pay for to have their products labeled GMO-free.

However, a review of the pros and cons of GMOs strongly suggests that the issue reflects a poor public understanding of the science behind them, along with a rebellion against the dominance of food and agricultural conglomerates. The anti-GMO movement, I'm afraid, risks throwing the baby out with the bathwater. What is needed is a dispassionate look at what GMOs mean and their actual and potential good, not just a fear of harmful possibilities.

???Are there risks to GMOs that scientists have yet to consider or discover? Of course there are. Nothing in this life is risk-free, but that is not enough reason to reject valuable scientific advances.

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: [Fears, Not Facts, Support GMO-Free Food](#)