

Why activist criticism of GMO salmon is more scare than substance

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

Some environmentalists are assailing the decision [to approve the AquaBounty genetically engineered salmon]. They call the salmon “Frankenfish.” Their objections sound a lot like previous allegations against genetically engineered crops. The allegations against GE crops didn’t stand up, as a [Slate investigation showed](#), and it doesn’t look as though the arguments against GE salmon will stand up, either. . . .

A press release from Friends of the Earth quotes a fish company owner, who says:

There were over 250 million wild salmon harvested in Alaska and Puget Sound this year. Why should we put this sustainable resource at risk for the benefit of a few multinational corporations who will, sooner or later, introduce GE salmon into their floating feed lots? Americans will be eating synthetic salmon, thinking they are receiving the nutritional benefits of wild salmon.

. . . It’s also worth noting that the allegation about “a few multinational corporations” (along with the insinuation about “nutritional benefits”) is bogus — the company behind the salmon, AquaBounty, has 21 employees — and that this bogus charge is coming from the salmon fishing industry. Murkowski and her Alaska colleagues are defending that industry. So this isn’t a fight between environmentalists and multinationals. It’s a fight between a well-represented trade lobby and a small innovator. That’s another lesson to take from the debate over GE crops: Look for commercial motives on [both sides](#).

Read full, original post: [Don’t Fear the Frankenfish](#)