

Dear Editor,

The April 11 op-ed by Elliot Entis ("Green Thumbs: Genetically engineered crops are more environmentally friendly than organic ones") failed to give your readers the basic facts they need to assess the potential and value of either kind of agriculture described.

Organic farming in compliance with the USDA's National Organic Program is required to actually accomplish what Entis denies it does: cuts harmful pesticide use *more than* does GMO crop production while it increases biodiversity in soil and the farm landscape. In fact, crop rotation and cover crop use are the most common ways organic farmers use to create farming systems that manage insects without the use of insecticides that are required (in the genes or as sprays) in GMO crops.

Advanced scientific work at our landgrant university schools of agriculture, the USDA Agricultural Research Service and parallel overseas research centers document the strong potential of organic agriculture to be productive, environmentally sound and equal to or better than GMO- and chemically-dependent agriculture at feeding people everywhere.

This same global research community is producing data on possible long-term negative direct and indirect impacts of GMO crop systems, justifying a reduction in their use.

Sincerely,