

Mark Lynas: Mandatory GMO labeling will make GMO opponents 'anti-choice'

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

[January 8th], in a hugely significant move, the food manufacturer Campbell Soup Company announced that it was supporting labeling of GMOs. . .

In my view this is a smart and very timely move by Campbell. It establishes the company as a leader and gets out in front of the endlessly polarized GMO debate with a stance that clearly supports the principle of consumer choice. Don't forget, Campbell has already trialled a new website detailing GMO ingredients (and other relevant info) in its products and found that the sky did not fall in.

. . . By taking a stance that appears to be opposing the consumer 'right to know', industry has not won itself any friends, and has cemented perceptions – eagerly built on by the anti-GMO lobby – that big corporations are trying to smuggle GMO products into the national food system. . .

Why must labeling be mandatory? Because otherwise many companies will not label, and those that do may be singled out by anti-GMO lobbyists for consumer boycotts and brand damage. . .

Let's look on the bright side of labeling too. Once GMO-derived products are labeled, there is no logical impediment to having more of them. Celiac-friendly baking products derived from GMO wheat? It's your choice. AquaBounty salmon? It's your choice. . . Labeling could lead to many more GMO products on our shelves, if consumers choose to buy them. Once products are labeled, asking then for a ban is illogical.

I want to make this point very clear. *Once GMO products are labeled, anti-GMO lobby groups will have sacrificed their best argument.*

**Read full, original post:** Campbells is right – it's time to introduce federal mandatory labeling