Should regulators consider CRISPR crops GMOs?

…What could be born of a union between…Monsanto…, and… Gene-Editing Tool, CRISPR/Cas9?

Well, what it *won't* be is a genetically modified organism, or GMO, The World's Most Notorious Acronym…

. . . .

The USDA has chosen not to designate crops created by DuPont and Caribou Biosciences using their own CRISPR techniques as GMOs. CRISPR results in genetically *optimized*, rather than modified, organisms, because there's no foreign DNA introduced to the original organism.

. . . .

[But] it's too soon to say with absolute certainty that a CRISPR/Cas9 organism is not, from a regulatory perspective, "genetically modified."

. . . .

What CRISPR/Cas9 will help Monsanto do is, ultimately, develop even more crops that are drought resistant and create cooking oils with more desirable nutritional profiles.

. . . .

…[W]hat we're more likely to see is a greater concentrated effort to develop drought-resistant strains of key staple crops such as corn, rice, soybeans, and wheat.

Monsanto's stated game is "yield." And yield is all about producing an increasing supply of staple crops from a shrinking supply of arable farmland around the world.

And climate change is only exacerbating that problem.

. . . .

Are we talking GMO "Frankenfood" or genetically optimized staple crops?

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: Genetically Optimized vs. Genetically Modified Organisms