

GMOs are a touchy subject at the dinner table. Is thoughtful debate possible?

The subject of GMOs can whip pleasant dinner conversation into an ugly froth. It's a complicated issue, produced with complicated science. Worse, many people don't understand anything about GMOs. Few people grasp the most basic aspects of GMOs (e.g. what the letters stand for).

The [wide consensus](#) in the scientific community is that GMOs have no measurable effects on human health. Only one study that showed GMOs to be dangerous and it was [debunked and discredited](#).

Why there is still such vocal opposition to GMOs? Articles and op-eds have flooded the Internet recently, suggesting that GM opponents are [dumb](#) or [anti-science](#). While there are legitimate reasons to stay wary of some GMOs (see: [Roundup Ready corn](#)), the subtleties get lost in the louder debate.

The debate about GM labeling, in a sense, has little to do with the pros and cons of genetically modified foods. It's about a consumer's right to know. But the anti-labelling lobby is strong and it's not just big agribusiness. Take [this op-ed](#) in Scientific American, arguing that GMO labels help to perpetuate the anti-science myths.

Some have argued for an alternate path, where only foods *without* GMOs would get labeled. Like "fair trade" it's a way of highlighting a niche quality some consumers might appreciate. These voluntary labels have already started popping up.

The House [bill](#) that would prevent states from mandating GMO labels doesn't have matching legislation in the Senate yet, but celebrities are [rushing to Washington](#) to slow the tide and encouraging others to [show support](#). Only time will tell how the issue will play out.

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: [Okay, Um, So, Uh, What Exactly Is All This Fuss Over GMOs?](#)