

Is labeling bill based on unscientific, arbitrary definition of GMO?

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

. . . [T]here's no such thing as a GMO, except in the fevered imagination of bureaucrats. . . and activists. The bipartisan "compromise" on GMO labeling . . . includes [an] . . . unscientific, politically motivated hodge-podge of products that makes . . . no sense. For example, corn or soybeans modified with recombinant-DNA . . . techniques would need to be labeled, while oils from them would not.

. . . [T]he new legislation covers labeling only if a food "contains genetic material that has been modified through in vitro recombinant . . . (DNA) techniques" and "for which the modification could not otherwise be obtained through conventional breeding or found in nature." Older techniques and . . . the newest gene-editing techniques would be exempt.

. . . .

All the hoopla over the labeling legislation is likely to be for naught. Its arbitrary, unscientific scope makes it extremely unlikely that the new legislation is constitutional. . . the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that labeling mandates are "compelled commercial speech," subject to "strict scrutiny" to ensure they don't run afoul of the . . . First Amendment. . . [W]ithout some compelling state interest, such as ensuring consumer safety. . . a requirement to label foods that contain "genetically engineered" ingredients, as defined, is unlikely to survive the strict-scrutiny standard.

**Read full, original post:** [What's in a Name? Plenty, if It's a 'GMO.'](#)