

Biotech advocates misjudged depth of distrust of corporations

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis.

What's most puzzling to those of who have covered the GMO debate is how GMO advocates in the scientific community stepped into the fray. It's as if they didn't recognize the playing field they are on. Anti-GMO sentiment springs from 1) [fear factors](#) (fear of the unknown) and 2) [industry distrust](#). When pro-GMO advocates decided in recent years to get serious about communicating with the public, did they not survey the landscape they would have to navigate?

When I was reporting the FOIA requests made of biotech scientists story, I was struck by the indignation biotech scientists expressed.

By participating in an industry-funded site, you set yourself up for extra close scrutiny of your dealings. Are you not aware that people have legitimate reason to be suspicious of industry?

To the best of my memory, every scientist I said this to waved me off. I got the, 'yeah, but...' *I never took any money...the science is the science, regardless of industry association...* Their collective cluelessness astonished me.

At first, Kevin Folta didn't understand why his interactions with Monsanto caused a fuss. After all, he was right about the science, so what did it matter that industry just wanted to help him amplify the facts?

But Folta and his colleagues are realizing, belatedly, that science does not speak for itself. If they had given more thought to the legacy that makes some rightfully suspicious of industry, if they had been more attuned to the freakish GMO landscape they operate in as science communicators, might they have done things differently?

Read full, original post: [On GMOs, Industry, Activists, Scientists, and Journalism](#)