

Viewpoint: Want to understand crop biotech? Avoid these discredited anti-GMO sources

Here's a tip for all the anti-GMO activists out there: If you ever want to get the last word in during a debate about biotechnology, just post a link to [\[Charles\] Benbrook](#) or [\[Gilles-Éric\] Séralini](#) or [\[Stephanie\] Seneff](#). Those kinds of sources will stop a discussion in its tracks, not because they carry any scientific validity but because you will typically be seen as either too far lost down the rabbit hole or as if you aren't really putting forth any effort. And that's disheartening for those of us who are interested in having real discussions about our food system.

[Editor's note: [Benbrook](#), [Séralini](#) and [Seneff](#) are academics well known for their anti-GMO views. Read GLP's analysis of their work at the links provided above.]

The pervasiveness of some of these discredited reports and fringe personalities fuel the toxicity against and frustrations of pro-GMO advocates in the social media sphere. It becomes hard [to combat the indoctrination](#) of the David Wolfes and Dr. Ozes and Food Babes of the world.

The same "research" gets circulated over and over. There's nothing new coming out to support that side of the debate, it's just being rewritten by another website that has "health" or "natural" in the url, and thus supports itself indefinitely.

Read full, original article: [Perspective: These anti-GMO sources hold no value in the biotech debate](#)