

Anti-GMO crusader Jeffrey Smith: 'Labeling GMOs was never the end goal it was a tactic to get them banned'

Because “public-interest” groups cloak themselves with the feel-good mantle of protecting consumers, the environment, animals, etc., the motives of such groups rarely get questioned. But . . . all too often, activists put their own self-interest before the public’s interest.

. . . .

[An] egregious example . . . arises from activists’ crusade for warning labels on food items containing . . . “GMOs.” Citing the results of manufactured push polls and petitions, proponents have long declared that consumers want to know if food products contained GMOs.

. . . .

In reacting to the federal [GMO labeling] law’s passage, some mandatory-labeling proponents confirmed that labeling has always been a means to much larger ends. For instance. . . the founder of the Institute for Responsible Technology. . . [implored](#) his followers that “we are still winning the . . . effort to eliminate GMOs from the market altogether. Labeling GMOs was never the end goal for us. It was a tactic [to get them banned]” . . .

IS LABELING REALLY ABOUT OUR "RIGHT TO KNOW" ?

"We are going to force them to label this food. If we have it labeled, then we can organize people not to buy it."

—*Andrew Kimbrell, Executive Director, Center for Food Safety*

"Personally, I believe GM foods must be banned entirely, but labeling is the most efficient way to achieve this. Since 85% of the public will refuse to buy foods they know to be genetically modified, this will effectively eliminate them from the market just the way it was done in Europe."

—*Dr. Joseph Mercola, Mercola.com*

"By avoiding GMOs, you contribute to the tipping point of consumer rejection, forcing them out of our food supply."

—*Jeffrey Smith, Founder, Institute for Responsible Technology*

"With labeling it (GMOs) will become 0%... For you the label issues is vital, if you get labeling then GMOs are dead-end."

—*Vandana Shiva, environmental activist*

"The burning question for us all then becomes how—and how quickly—can we move healthy, organic products from a 4.2% market niche, to the dominant force in American food and farming? The first step is to change our labeling laws."

—*Ronnie Cummins, Director, Organic Consumers Association*



www.geneticliteracyproject.org

SOURCES:

<http://www.responsibletechnology.org/10-Reasons-to-Avoid-GMOs>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hkf39YWtmg>
<http://www.commondreams.org/view/2012/08/02-0>
<http://www.activistcash.com/person/1562-andrew-kimbrell/>
<http://vtdigger.org/2012/04/17/wanzek-genetically-modified-food-is-perfectly-healthy>
<http://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2012/02/29/new-vermont-gmo-labeling-policy-officially-introduced.aspx>

The pursuit of prohibition behind the veil of consumers' "right to know" would be the ultimate betrayal of the public interest. . . . most consumers prefer the healthy option of cheaper food produced with the benefit of harmless GMO technology. . . .

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: [Crusade Or Charade: What's Really Motivating Efforts To Mandate GMO-Labeling?](#)