

Viewpoint: Food security decisions—like GMO salmon approval—shouldn't be left to public's whims

[What] the [food sector] is expecting AquaBounty to do is to step out into the cold and take account of the very brutal reality the seafood industry in general has been consciously avoiding... that full and frank honesty about where their product comes from will open a Pandora's box of public pre- and mis-conceptions about what this means. Pre- and mis-conceptions they don't have the funds or power to change overnight. So, until this work has been done and the rational result achieved, and while we exist in a maelstrom of misinformation and scare stories, maybe it is in the best interests of society that we leave complex decision making about the future of our food security to impartial bodies who know what they're talking about

...

Unfortunately, until GM becomes a positive marketing message, any AquaBounty product labeled as such will rot on the shelves on which it is set, and the very concept of GM protein and all its potential positive impacts will be sent back to the drawing board.

Do we really want our future survival to be reliant on being able to market it convincingly enough to a consumer base looking for the slightest reason not to pick up a seafood product in the first place?

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: [In defense of the GM salmon 'cowards'](#)