

## Opinion: Food Evolution movie gets science right—but that won't likely convince 'GMO-averse people'

*[Editor's note: Keith Kloor is a freelance writer and adjunct journalism lecturer at New York University.]*

Unfortunately, there's no good reason to think [Food Evolution] will be any more successful at correcting the popular misperceptions and stereotypes around GMOs than [Pulitzer Prize–winning *New York Times* journalist Amy] Harmon's thoughtful piece [[“A Lonely Quest for Facts on Genetically Modified Crops”](#)] (or several others since, including, for example, one [in this very magazine](#)). The film, like any good documentary, wants to be the arbiter of a debate over evidence. In reality, it ought to have admitted that what it is facing is an ideologically charged debate that, like climate change, is increasingly immune to facts.

*Food Evolution* leans heavily on science and scientific authority to make its argument. ... Will this change anyone's mind?

As we say in Brooklyn, fughetaboutit. I'm skeptical that the film will have any impact on GMO-averse people because I *know* GMO-averse people. ... For them, the GMO debate is not about science; it is about emotions.

**The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion, and analysis. Read full, original post: [Food Evolution Is Scientifically Accurate. Too Bad It Won't Convince Anyone.](#)**