

Viewpoint: Proposed GMO labeling laws too vague to benefit consumers

Knowing simply whether a food is modified does not actually protect consumers...Different crops and modifications come with different biological, health, and ethical considerations — each modification may have a different purpose, mechanism, and/or outcome. To lump them together is literally comparing ([slow-rotting](#)) apples to ([disease-resistant](#)) oranges.

Let's consider the implications of two specific GMO crops: Bt corn and golden rice.

...

Advocates for the current proposals on GMO labeling say that labeling a product genetically modified provides consumers more information. But if a consumer has concerns about local insect populations, Bt crops may be a valid worry while golden rice would not be an issue.

Simply labeling both GMO does not convey any useful information. These are simply two cases of how crops can be modified...But current proposals for the implementation of GMO labeling would treat them all the same.

The issue with simply labeling things as GMO is that it ends the conversation and does not leave anyone better informed. We could reduce pesticide use, spare children some of the pain of malnutrition, and lower the cost of fresh fruits and vegetables, but we need to consider what is happening in each crop individually.

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: [Why GMO labeling laws won't help US consumers make better decisions](#)