

Are romantic notions about organic agriculture harming the environment?

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

It is one of the great ironies of our time: wealthy environmentalists want to return humanity to some pastoral ideal in which everyone enjoys fresh farm food and clean air, but they also oppose the very technologies that can help to get us there. Their technophobia is pervasive, whether it's about nuclear power, which is both the safest and cleanest source of energy known to humanity, or genetic engineering in agriculture, which can raise yields, reduce costs, and benefit the environment.

. . . .

[A] [recent study](#) conducted at Purdue University found that rejecting genetically modified organisms in agriculture would harm both the environment and the economy.

. . . .

The lead researcher, Wally Tyner. . . said: "Some of the same groups that oppose GMOs want to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to reduce the potential for global warming. . . .you can't have it both ways. If you want to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in agriculture, an important tool to do that is with GMO traits."

. . . .

Moreover, the use of GM crops reduced the need for chemical pesticides by 17.6%, which is a cost benefit to farmers and an environmental benefit to boot.

. . . .

Modern-day romantics might idealise organic farming, but the refusal of organic farmers to adopt modern scientific practices means it actually [isn't the most environmentally-friendly way to farm](#). . . [T]heir ideals come at a cost which is not affordable for the poor and the hungry. This might all be a forgivable indulgence, if they weren't determined to impose their aesthetic ideals upon the rest of society, by means of labels, restrictions and bans.

Read full, original post: [GMOs are good for the environment](#)