

Is the problem really GMOs or overpopulation?

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

UCLA's *Institute of the Environment and Sustainability* (the IOES) hosted a panel [April 19] on *GMOS: Global Solution or Global Risk?*. . . . the discussion focused mainly on long-term economic and ecological trends in world agriculture.

. . . .

. . . [W]hat became clear is that there is a sharp demarcation between the popular complaints about GMOs and the reality. The existence of GMO technology by itself doesn't seem to be the issue. Rather, it is the impoverished state of much of the world's population, and what the rest of the world might be able to do about it. The argument seems to settle into concerns about private megacorporations controlling the development, production, and sale of next year's seeds.

But here is a topic that was not mentioned by any of the panelists, by the moderator, or by any of the audience questions: Aren't we really talking about the effects of the human population explosion? After all, if the population were half what it is today (and not expanding), then we would have some wiggle room to expand agricultural technology, preserve wild habitats, and potentially live free of starvation. As it is, we are using almost every available spot of open land to grow food to feed ourselves, without concern or respect for the other species we are destroying.

I suspect that the topic of GMOs could be useful in provoking the broader discussion,. . . .shouldn't we be talking about a more serious approach to human population, just as we need to be talking about a more serious approach to global warming?

**Read full, original post:** [Genetically Modified Organisms: It's Not What You Think!](#)