

The More Things Change...

Paul Bond Jr.*

Brewton-Parker College, Vernon, USA

***Corresponding Author:** Paul Bond Jr, Ph.D., M.Div. Brewton-Parker College, Mt. Vernon, GA 30445, USA.

Received: November 19, 2015; **Published:** December 08, 2015

The buzz from the politically controlled, leftist leaning media is almost overwhelming at times. From their daily propagandizing, one would certainly believe that organic food production is much safer and better in nutritional value than non-organic sources of food. Even the USDA website that defines what it means to produce organic food has listed as one of its objectives “do not use genetically modified ingredients [1].” Thus, if you subscribe to all this you would be certain to have your mind made up that “sustainable” agriculture is the way to go. But is that truly what the facts are?

Recently, Van Eenennaam and Young published a review article that summarized over 100 research articles on the subject of genetically modified feed grains and their effects on livestock health. What was their conclusion? After feeding livestock genetically modified feedstuffs for over 20 years there are no ill effects. To quote, “animals fed diets containing GE (genetically engineered) crop products have revealed no unexpected perturbations or disturbing trends in animal performance or health indicators [2].” Moreover, these same authors go on to state, “there are no detectable or reliably quantifiable traces of GE components in milk, meat, and eggs following consumption of the GE feed [3].” So let’s state this plainly. After 20 years of experience, billions of animals and poultry fed, there are NO ill effects of genetically modified grains to animals or humans.

What then of fruits and vegetables? The Mayo Clinic states that while organically grown vegetables have lower pesticide residues than traditionally grown crops, all vegetables have to below government guidelines to be placed on the market. As for the nutritional value of organic versus non-organic vegetables, the Mayo Clinic states, “organically and conventionally produced foodstuffs are not significantly different in their nutrient content [4].” So it seems for all the uproar that what is true for livestock feeds is also true for fruits and vegetables. There are no great benefits to organically grown food. Even the argument of locally grown versus imported food has weak knees in that many parts of the United States have selenium poor soils. If one only ate locally grown vegetables from selenium poor soil the status of his/her glutathione peroxidase levels might be called into question. Even the great specter of epigenetics deals more with the nutrients already in the food and how those nutrients impact gene expression versus how the food is produced. So what is an animal or human nutritionist to do?

From a look at the data, it does not appear that a nutritionist should push to have food products from one source or another. The more things change, the more they stay the same. Regardless of how the food is produced, amino acids are amino acids and vitamins are vitamins. One would do better to concern themselves with the bioavailability of these nutrients than to believe the propaganda from the left. To lose ones objectivity is to truly admit ones ignorance on this subject. By the way, we invented genetically modified crops in an effort to decrease the amount of herbicides and pesticides used on feedstuffs and food. The more the left gets their way, the less satisfied they become.

Bibliography

1. Organic Agriculture. United States Department of Agriculture.
2. Van Eenennaam and Young. "Prevalence and Impacts of Genetically Engineered Feedstuffs on Livestock Populations". *Journal of Animal Science* 92 (2014): 4255-4278.
3. Ibid.
4. Healthy Lifestyle, Nutrition and healthy eating.

Volume 2 Issue 6 December 2015

© All rights are reserved by Paul Bond Jr.