

Mandatory labels necessary? Phone apps, non-GMO project already help consumers avoid GMOs

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

When polled, 89 percent American voters express support for laws like Vermont's, but that support is misguided and driven by exaggerated claims from anti-GMO activists. GMO labeling is burdensome, expensive and unnecessary because GMOs are safe, and consumers who want to avoid GMOs can already do so.

Advocates of mandatory GMO labeling claim they are simply fighting for consumers' right to decide for themselves. This is misleading. Consumers who really care can already "decide for themselves." Simple instructions on avoiding GMOs are available from many sources. . . And there are at least 10 apps designed to inform consumers on which foods contain GMOs and which do not.

Plus, GMO labels already exist for concerned consumers. The non-profit Non-GMO Project has begun certifying and labeling foods that contain little to no genetically modified [ingredients](#). . . .

. . . .

Such alarm may push food companies to change their products from GMO to non-GMO. If companies do make this change, the overall effects of GMO labeling could cost American families up to \$1,050 per year in higher food prices. . .

Given the existing options for consumers and lack of credible evidence of the dangers of GMOs, the continuing crusade to mandate costly GMO labeling is puzzling. The American consumer should not have to pay for this hysteria.

Ryan Yonk, an assistant professor of research at Utah State University, is vice president and executive director of research at Strata. Jadyn Naylor is a student research associate at Strata.

Read full, original post: [Commentary: Mandatory GMO labeling is unnecessary](#)