A Special Interview with Jeffrey Smith
By Dr. Mercola

JS: Jeffrey Smith
DM: Dr. Joseph Mercola, DO

INTRODUCTION: Welcome everyone. I'm just enormously delighted to have with us today Jeffrey Smith who is clearly one of the most profoundly knowledgeable experts in the genetically modified foods topic especially as it relates to their implementation in the United States.

He's really been at the forefront of leading a campaign to eliminate the GMO foods from the United States, just as essentially it's been done in Europe.

The reason we are on the phone today is to review a study that was actually not yet published but it was announced.

It was done in Russia by a Russian biologist, Dr. Alexey Surov. The study was conducted by the Institute of Ecology and Evolution of the Russian Academy of Sciences and essentially their equivalent of the NIH which is the National Association for Gene Security.

It's anticipated that this study will be published some time this summer. The technical details aren't yet released but there is enough information to certainly at least engage in a discussion on it.

For those of you who aren't familiar with your work perhaps you can highlight some of the achievements you've been able to be successful with to date and then we can go on to the study.

JS: Well what I do is document the enormous amount of health risks, both adverse findings and theoretical risks, associated with genetically modified foods.

We looked at dozens and actually hundreds and hundreds of studies, not just on the annual feeding studies, but also what we know about the DNA and about how it expresses, and how things can go wrong. We're working with more than 30 scientists and we've identified 65 different health risks in my book *Genetic Roulette.*

But the release of this new information provides yet another risk and confirmation on some earlier problems.

And, in this case, they used hamsters, which are a new laboratory animal that hasn't yet been featured in genetically modified safety studies.

They took hamsters and fed them for two years, and they went through three different generations. They were looking essentially for effects of genetically modified soy on reproductive capacity and on growth of the hamsters.

Now, before I tell you what happened, and it's kind of dramatic, I want to tell you what genetically modified soy is.

They took genes from bacteria and forced it into the DNA of the soybean plant. The gene that they inserted produces a protein that allows the plant not to die when sprayed with Monsanto's roundup herbicide.

So essentially, these roundup ready soybean plants drink poison. They drink the roundup herbicide and they don't die. And it's used basically for weed control.

DM: This roundup, this is a pesticide that actually has fluoride in it also?

JS: I'm not sure. The active ingredient is glyphosate which is not fluoride but they have many, many compounds that they had used in addition to the glyphosate to make the glyphosate more toxic and more effective.

And the combination of these other compounds with the glyphosate makes it worse more in human beings.

They get some potential birth defects and possible cancer and what not. It's drenched in these sieving fields in much higher concentrations and the residues are much higher when people eat the genetically modified soy. So that's one of the potential dangers of eating genetically modified crops because most of them are engineered for higher amounts of (inaudible 4:30).

DM: The belief that genetically modified foods are dangerous nearly always fails to acknowledge this point.

It's absolutely independent of the genetics. The consequences of having this gene is that they are saturating the crops with a very potent pesticide which invariably winds up in the food and in your body.

I'm not sure it's out of blind ignorance or just stupidity that they are unaware of the dangers of consuming pesticides.

JS: I would say for those who are the PR advocates of the biotech industry, they don't know well that they are promoting deception. They say that it can feed the world. That it reduces pesticide use, that it increases yields, and it's absolutely the opposite in all those cases.

In fact, a study that was released recently show that in the first 13 years of genetically modified crops 383 million pounds more herbicide was used because of these roundup ready and other herbicides that are in crops, and then what happened was that originally, in the first two years, there was a reduction of herbicides, but then it was mixed for two or three years and then it started to increase and now rapidly accelerate.

But the biotech industry will only quote the first three years because that is when it was reduced. So they ignore the most recent documents and the most recent evidence because that conveniently supports their myth that it will reduce the use of pesticides.

DM: Thank you for expanding on that because it's an argument of course that is frequently used to justify their use.

So why don't we go back to the study which is really enlightening or expanding on our knowledge of the dangers of these interventions.

JS: So they took the soy that we actually eat in our diets, unless we're careful, and I recommend that to avoid it, but the genetically modified soy that's produced on 91% of the soy acreage in the United States. They fed it to the hamsters as part of the diet.

They used (inaudible 6:27) hamsters which have fast reproduction rates. One group was fed a normal diet without any soy whatsoever, another group had non-GM soy, a third used GM soy, genetically modified, and a fourth contained even higher amounts of genetically modified soy.

Then they took five pairs of hamsters for each group, each of which produced about seven to eight litters totaling about 140 animals.

Alexey Surov said, originally, everything went smoothly. However, we noticed quite a serious effect when we selected new pairs from their cubs and continued to feed them as before.

These (inaudible 7:08) growth rate was slower and reached their sexual maturity slowly.

So, the first generation of GM fed offspring had problems.

They didn't see problems in the original parents but only in the offspring, their growth rate was slower and they were slower to reach their sexual maturity.

He then selected new pairs from that second generation and they generated another 39 litters. There were 52 pups born to the control group where no soy was fed; 78 to the non-GM soy group.

However, in the genetically modified soy group, only 40 pups were born and of these, 25% died.

That was a five-fold higher death rate than the 5% normal death rate that was happening in the controls, and then the hamsters that ate the high levels of GM soy, nearly all of the animals had lost the ability to have babies.

Only a single female hamster gave birth to 16 pups. And of those, one fifth of them died, again, a much higher death rate.

So Alexey Surov in our email conversation, he said, the low numbers in this third generation showed that many animals were sterile. That was in the animals that were eating genetically modified soy.

DM: Wow, that's amazing. Now, was the second generation, the subsequent generations also eating the genetically modified soy?

JS: Yes. All of the GM soy group and the high GM soy group always ate GM soy as part of their diet.

But they didn't see the sterility in the first generation or the second generation. It was only between the second generation and the third generation where they couldn't give birth.

Now, it doesn't end there. They also found that some of the third generation GM soy fed hamsters had hair growing inside their mouths.

DM: I've never heard of that.

JS: Well, you see it's a very rare phenomenon. In fact, Alexey Surov was one of the authors of the study that was produced last year that showed these really disgusting photos of hair. Big pockets and empty pockets filled with hair and covered with mucus inside the mouths of these hamsters.

He said it's a very rare phenomenon but he had never seen in his life, more hair in mouths of hamsters than with these GM soy fed third generation hamsters.

And so, it's not a completely new thing but it seems to be a much more prevalent feature among the hamsters that ate genetically modified soy.

So to me it's a horrible thought. And again, we're not seeing it until the third generation.

DM: That is just shocking. Can you remind us, myself and the listeners, as to when GM crops were introduced into the United States in large measure?

JS: Well, it started in 1996. That was with soy and corn and some cotton for cotton seed oil, and then a little bit of canola mixed with (inaudible 10:15) the following year.

Now, someone had shown me some documentation and found that there were lower birth weight babies that started in mid-1990's that had been increasing since then. So, there is a coincidence perhaps…

We don't know, but there is also an increase in infertility as well as infant mortality.

I think the United States; we're only 47th in the world in terms of infant mortality, so we have a high level of babies that are dying and we don't know if genetically modified foods are (inaudible 10:47).

DM: That was present prior to the introduction of GM crops. I mean the United States system has been deteriorating for quite a large number of years and a major collapse occurred in the mid-70's when they figured out how to make high fructose corn syrup and that was the beginning of the end for a lot of metabolic processes.

JS: Right, and also the infertility was also on the increase. It was increasing but it also increased more since GMO crops were introduced. But again, here, we're speculating because no one is actually monitoring the population to see if GMOs are causing these health problems.

In Canada, the Canadian version of the FDA, Health Canada, announced in 2002 that they would monitor the health of Canadians to see if GMOs were causing problems but within a year, they gave up the study saying it was too difficult.

DM: I guess the point of going down the road of trying to figure out the timing is this new study shows clearly, many of the most significant side effects are not occurring in the groups who are actually consuming the genetically modified foods. It's actually the subsequent generations, their offspring and even worse yet, the offspring of their offspring, so the grandchildren.

And we have not certainly had not gotten to the grandchild phase. I mean, certainly, the first generation in a few cases, but we certainly haven't even begun to hit the second generation because these things were all introduced 15 years ago.

JS: I asked the biologist Alexey Surov, the main scientist in this hands-on study what he thinks about eating GMOs and his opinion was we should wait until the studies are done.

He says, "We have no right to use GMOs until we understand the possible adverse effects, not only to ourselves" but as you've said, "to future generations as well."

We definitely need to fully detailed studies to clarify this. Any type of contamination has to be tested before we consume it and GMO is just one of them. So he is strong even though he said, he needs to continue to evaluate his samples. He's collected mud samples and he wants to analyze hormone levels. He's trying to raise funds for that.

He's collected the documentation of the size of the testes, spleen, uterus, etcetera and other organs that will be evaluated. But he said, we don't know if it's genetic modification. We don't know if it's the extra herbicides. We don't know if there some contamination.

He wants to be clear but he is saying we shouldn't wait until we have the details before avoiding GMOs. There is just no justification for having them in the diet.

DM: Well I couldn't agree more. Anyone who is rational would take a prudent approach. It would seem more than wise to implement the precautionary principle and in fact that's what's been implemented in Europe for the most part.

But, in this country, and maybe you can update us as to where we are, there has been massive corporate influences that essentially limited or prevented the application of the precautionary principle in this country. And as a result, they're amassing or putting together massive amounts of profits for the result of implementing these technologies and it's a short term profit.

I mean, they are gaining their money but its coming at a price, and the price is not even necessarily people are consuming it, but their descendants.

I'm wondering if you can update us as to where we're at with respect to limiting the use of GM crops in the United States?

JS: Well, unfortunately, the Obama Administration has not been forthcoming with his personal campaign promise to label GMOs. He has placed the person in charge of U.S. food safety, Michael Taylor, the U.S. food safety czar -- he was Monsanto's former attorney and then became the person in charge of policy of the FDA when the GMO policy was being created in 1992 and basically gave, you know, waived GMOs under the market without any labeling, without any required testing and the policy that he oversaw aligned, claiming that the agency wasn't aware of information showing that GMOs were different when in fact, it was the overwhelming consensus among the scientists at the FDA and they were very concerned and they were ignored.

Then Michael Taylor became Monsanto's vice president and now, he's in charge of U.S. food safety.

So, I would say that the government is not in a position right now to make reasonable and responsible decisions related to GMOs, but we have an amazing momentum now to drive GMOs out of the market through consumer concern.

Now, I want to tell you something more about some studies to make that concern even more pronounced because I don't want to give the listeners the impression that this hamster study is some isolated study with no support.

We have a whole list of reproductive problems linked to GMOs and one of the most dramatic also occurred in Russia.

In 2005, in October, Dr. Irina Ermakova, who is one of the senior scientists with the Russian National Academy of Sciences, reported that more than half of the babies from mother rats that were fed genetically modified soy died within three weeks. That was compared to only a 10% death rate among the controls.

Now, we just heard that five times the number of hamsters died in terms of the babies that were born and here, five times the number of rats died also in a GM soy experiment.

We also heard that the hamsters were growing more slowly, as well among the rats, in the Ermakova study. The size of the rat offspring was much less on average than the control groups, and when they tried to mate the offspring of the rats from the GM soy fed group, they could not reproduce.

So there was an infertility or sterility in the offspring after *one generation in the rats*, which we were seeing in the *second and third generation in the hamsters*.

Now, just like the current study with the hamsters, Ermakova had wanted to do an analysis of the organs that she had preserved and all this. She said to the scientific community, please provide us some financial support so we can do further investigations. Please repeat these studies so we can verify whether in fact it's accurate.

Well no one has repeated it. She didn't actually get more money. In fact, she told me as we were sitting at the EU Parliament after giving a presentation there, that her boss had been pressured by his boss. So, she was told to do no more GM food study on animals, her documents were burned on her desk, samples were stolen from her laboratory and one of her colleagues tried to comfort her by saying, well maybe the GM soy will solve the overpopulation problem on earth. She wasn't impressed.

Now, what happened was she's been vilified and attacked by the biotech industry, but there has been one criticism which is actually valid and that is, she didn't do a biochemical analysis of the feed to see if there was some potential toxin that had worked its way into the feed that was responsible for these astounding results.

But, after doing this study three times with similar results, she found, coincidentally, that the rat chow which was being fed to all of the rats in the facility switched so it became based on genetically modified soy.

So she couldn't do any more studies because she had no more controls, but she had a brilliant idea. After two months, she asked all of her colleagues, what's the infant mortality in your studies? They were doing GM studies, at least they didn't know they

were, but they were feeding all of their rats genetically modified soy and it had skyrocketed.

The infant mortality had skyrocketed to over 55%, sometimes (inaudible 18:55) there wasn't a particular toxin in her rats but it was a generic problem with GM soy.

DM: Where was the research done? What university?

JS: It was National Academy of Scientific Laboratory in Moscow.

DM: Okay, excellent.

JS: Now, when we were in the EU Parliament, she gave me a slide of a completely new study in which she fed male rats genetically modified soy and it's absolutely stunning.

On the left side of the slide is a pink testicle. On the right side of the slide, is a blue testicle.

She said, when the GM soy was fed to the male rats, it changed the color of their testicles from pink to blue and you could see the cells on another slide, left to right, the structure of the cells in the testicle was different; a completely different blood flow.

And this reminded me of what they had studied in Italy where they fed mice genetically modified soy and they also had changes in their testicles including damage to the young sperm cells.

Now, if you're damaging the young sperm cells, it could result in one of two things.

They can result in infertility or problems with the offspring. Well, it appears that they may have had both. In fact, with the mice, they looked at the offspring and they took the embryos out of the pregnant mothers, very young embryos, and they looked at how the DNA was functioning.

And they compared the DNA of those who were born to GM soy fed parents versus those who are fed to the non-GM soy and the DNA functioned differently.

So we're seeing a fundamental change in the offspring of mice that were fed genetically modified soy whose parents were also fed genetically modified soy.

DM: Interesting observation. It's quite concerning to hear these startling results and the impact of feeding these foods to animals, laboratory animals.

JS: Its not just soy either.

I mean, the Austrian government did one of the very few long term feeding studies before this hamster study. They found that when they fed genetically modified corn to mice, the longer they fed the corn, the fewer the babies the mice had and the smaller the babies were.

DM: These startling results are certainly significant and there is a term in (inaudible 21:25) or the facts speak for themselves. These are really very significant issues going on.

But I'm wondering, just out of a personal scientific curiosity, as to any speculation you might have as to what the actual mechanism is?

Is the fact that these crops are contaminated with pesticides? Is it because the DNA is altered in the crops? What seems to be triggering this infertility?

JS: Well, you know the process of genetic engineering leads to massive collateral damage in the DNA and cause an increase or decrease in a whole host of compounds as well as the production of completely novel compounds that didn't exist in the plant before.

So it's really a thing to consider. Now, we know that we're seeing the genetically modified soy causing these problems in the hamsters and the rats and the mice.

Now, the corn was genetically modified both to produce a toxin called BT, which normally kills insects, and also it was roundup ready. So it could be sprayed with roundup.

Now, if we look in the livestock that are showing reproductive problems, we see that more associated with the BT or the pesticide producing corn or cotton seed.

There was a farmer called Jerry Roseman who is a friend of mine in central Iowa. He had trouble getting his pigs pregnant and he tried all sorts of things, brought in all sorts of experts; veterinarians supplement experts, feed experts. He finally traced the problem to genetically modified corn and found that two or three of his neighbors were having the same problems and feeding the same corn.

So he reported it to the newspapers and magazines or even a TV show. And every time it was reported, more and more farmers called Jerry up and said, "You know, I saw that show and I'm having the same problem and I also am using genetically modified corn."

Now, coincidentally, researchers are Baylor College of Medicine accidentally discovered that rats that were raised on corn cob bedding, which was probably corn cob crushed right near Jerry's house, were also showing problems with reproductive behavior.

The females would stop their cycling. The males would stop their sexual behavior.

They found that there were two types of sexual effective compounds that were able to cause problems at 200-fold lower concentrations than classical phytoestrogens.

They found that the amount, that the difference, there was a difference in the amount of these compounds depending on whether something was genetically modified or not. So it's possible in this case with the corn that there was some of this problem that's compounded, it curtailed sexual behavior and sexual activity, could have been increased in the corn which caused the problems in the animals.

But at India, we find that buffalo that eat genetically modified cottonseed, most of them are suffering from reproductive problems including infertility, frequent abortions, premature deliveries, as well as prolapsed uteruses, and also death among both the adults and the young buffalos.

So it's hard to say, because it's happening with soy and corn and cotton.

And we don't know, because what happened to Ermakova in terms of stopping her follow up, has happened over and over again. Whenever a scientist discovers a problem, mysteriously, their funding disappears or they get fired, or they're told to move to a different project. And so, we don't have in hand, the kind of scientific tools to properly answer that question.

DM: It really doesn't matter anyway because the end result is what we're looking to achieve and it's just really a personal curiosity to document this but it's a big challenge, there is no question.

As the evidence continues to pour in, I think there is more and more documentation supporting these concerns. Its just wonderful to have a resource like you who can actually go to these conferences, discuss, connect, and communicate with the experts who are doing the research and then share that information with us and really inspire and motivate us to continue to share this information with their friends and family and the community, because the real key to this as you mentioned earlier is not going to be to the government.

The political lobbyists have effectively manipulated the Monsanto (inaudible 26:11) to be within the very core of Obama's administration. There is no way we're going to have government…the government is not going to rescue us from this.

It has to come from the consumers.

So as education--, and we have to continue to educate and spread the word and make the choice with our pocketbook, and really avoid any of these foods that are genetically modified.

JS: What we have is a non-GMO shopping guide, at www.NonGMOshoppingGuide.com and that makes it much easier.

I know because I travel all over the country. I travel about 160, 170 days a year and so eating out in restaurants, you can avoid GMOs but you have to know what to look for.

There are eight genetically modified food crops.

There is soy, corn, cottonseed, which is used in oil as well as the canola oil, there is sugar from sugar beets and there is (inaudible 27:09) from Hawaii and a little bit of Zucchini and (inaudible 27:12) squash.

Now, unfortunately, the soy and the corn derivatives are practically omnipresent in processed foods. But, we list the different derivatives in the shopping guide and most effectively, we actually list hundreds of brand products in 22 food categories that are non-GMO.

So, people will need to take the documentation into the supermarket and figure out which brands will work for them that are non-GMO, and then they can replace the food and the products in their cupboard with healthier non-genetically modified products.

Not only does that protect us but as you said so beautifully, it creates a pressure on the marketplace.

This is not a vague, not well understood pressure by the food industry. This pressure is already creating a change, the fastest growing claim amongst store brands in 2009 was GMO free and Supermarket News, which is a trade journal that's used for predictions for the food industry, predicted that because of our shopping guide, www.NonGMOshoppingGuide.com as well as our new third party verified system for making non-GMO claims called, The Non-GMO Project, because of our two new website and programs, they said that 2010 will see an unprecedented upsurge of consumer awareness and concern about GMO's, and we're linking that with transfats and carbs and salt and sugar, which has changed the way that companies produce food in the past.

So they are basically saying that if things move along the way that they are predicting, we may see a tipping point.

And this is my word, a tipping point of consumer rejection which we think can be achieved with as little as 5% of U.S. shoppers avoid GM ingredients, we can drive it out of the market as happened in Europe.

When they received their tipping point in April of 1999 because of high profile coverage in the media within a single week, virtually every major food company committed to stop using GM ingredients and that's what's kept it out of that continent.

DM: Well it's a bit more challenging with the political lobbying that we have in this country but we are making progress, as you mentioned, and the other point to validate

your issue is the effectiveness of this type of strategy is the progress you've made and seen with high fructose corn syrup.

Just recently within the last few weeks, there has been major corporations who are actually taking high fructose corn syrup out of their products and highly promoting it only because of the significant public awareness and pressure that this is something dangerous and it should be avoided.

Now, the replacement, regular cane sugar, which is certainly a step in the right direction but something that still should be avoided in large quantities of course, but it does show that the strategy works, which is the key thing.

JS: And I want to say that America owes you a great debt of gratitude for that because I know you've been at the forefront of alerting consumers about the dangers, guiding them into healthier products without the high fructose corn syrup. I think that you're work here in this issue may have saved so many lives and so many people from getting diabetes or other problems. So, thank you and congratulations on that.

DM: Well, you're welcome there. It's definitely a passion, as is eliminating GMO foods from this country. It's a doable, achievable goal.

I mean this is not some type of idol fantasy to think God, wouldn't the world be nice if we could do this?

We CAN do it. We know we can do it. We just have to collaborate and work together as a team.

I have a few questions. Since this was an animal study, I had heard and maybe you can validate or dispute this, but if animals are offered the option of two food sources, one genetically modified food like corn or soy and one that is not, will they routinely and consistently avoid the genetically modified food or is that just a myth?

JS: It's not just a myth. In fact, we have eyewitness reports from scientists, farmers, reporters and the public over and over again, that when given the choice, a whole slew of different species will avoid GMOs.

I interviewed one of the first people to do this experiment, Howard (inaudible 31:35) from Iowa, and he was growing GM and non-GM on his property to compare the two, and then he decided to put one half of the feed bunk with GM corn and the other half with non-GM corn.

He let his cows into the paddock and they all gathered around the non-GM corn, ate it completely, and then walked away from the GM corn.

And so he started telling others and then about seven or eight farmers did this experiment, for two years, where they would let two or three pigs or cows into the area

where there was a trough of GM corn right in front of them and a non-GM trough a little bit further away.

The animals would come and they would sniff maybe taste the genetically modified variety and they would look over and see another trough and then they would go on, and they finished that off completely, they would go back to the original trough and look at it, maybe smell it, and then walk away.

We know that one reporter saw an entire flock of geese only eating off of the side of a soy field that was non-GMO.

We know that the scientists recreated the flavors, say of tomato, that was genetically engineered and approved in 1994 – fortunately, it's no longer on the market – they said that the rats refused to eat the tomato.

There was a guy that took squirrels and he took corn on the cob and put one corn that was genetically modified on one tree and non-GM on the other and always the squirrels would only eat the non-GM corn, so he decided to just leave the GM corn out for the coldest 10 days of winter in Iowa and they completely refused to touch it.

Eventually, they just nibbled like a couple of kernels and then that was it. So he felt sorry for them and then put up the non-GM kernels and it was gone the next day.

I know someone heard about that and decided they wanted to repeat the experiments and they bought a bag of GM corn and non-GM corn and put both bags in their garage to wait for the winter but when they went to the garage to collect the bags they realized the mice had done the experiments for them because they had broken into the corn and eaten all the kernels and never touched the GM corn.

And it goes on to chickens and raccoons and elk and deer and rats as well, and we have the buffalo in India where they say that most of the buffalo refused to eat the cottonseed cake from a genetically modified cotton, but those that do, most of them have reproductive problems and many of them die and their children die.

So, somehow the animals have a sense that we don't have, so we need to raise humans up to the level of animals.

DM: Well, thank you so much for that elaborate and comprehensive proof and documentation of what is clearly and obvious and major clue. As you mentioned most of us just are not in touch with our feelings and our feedback when it comes to these foods and we just don't have the sensory capacity, or just out of the biological logic, to distinguish the difference.

What appears to be, from what you mentioned, the entire animal kingdom, when given the choice between a genetically modified food and one that is not, will consistently and

regularly almost to the point of killing themselves from starvation, chose the food that is non-genetically modified.

So that is just an enormous, amazing, incredible clue and documentation that we need to make similar choices.

I would encourage everyone listening to use that as the major inspiration to go out and make a difference. You can make a difference.

We've said that we already are doing it for the high fructose corn syrup and are making progress in these other areas. So clearly the single most important you can do now is to get this guide that Jeffrey has put together and to understand what the foods are, share it with your friends and family, have them make their economic vote by avoiding these foods and when enough people make this vote, we used the tipping point.

There are not a lot of people, it's only perhaps 5%, and the industry will respond, they will avoid this.

Its not some type of evil conspiracy that they want to depopulate the planet, they're only doing it for economic means. And if they can be shown economically that it's not to their long term advantage, they will make the positive choice for your health, and not only your health but more importantly, as we've identified, the health of the future generations which is really going to be the most significantly impacted.

So Jeffrey how can they get access to your guide?

JS: Well, go to www.NonGMOshoppingGuide.com and it's available online.

We also have an iPhone application available in the iTunes store. It's free. You can download ShopNoGMO.

And we have from the website; you can order guides to give out to friends. You can download a two page guide. You can simply look at it online and chose your brands from there.

From there you can click over to our other site www.ResponsibleTechnology.org and get tools to help spread the word to accelerate the tipping point.

We have free online videos, free online pod casts, we have articles that you can read or reproduce on your own websites and printout and put it and publish, and we have all sorts of materials that take the information about the health risks and the cover up and the hijack regulatory agencies, and how to avoid GMOs and protect yourself, and how to get the information out to health conscious shoppers, healthcare practitioners, parents and young children, green groups, religious organizations, all those that are most receptive.

We have enough people on our side who are receptive to this message so we can eliminate GMOs from the supermarkets without ever having to try and convince someone who is resistant. Because most Americans would say they would avoid GMOs if given the choice, and now we can give them a choice.

DM: Absolutely. Thank you for all your efforts and I appreciate all you're doing, you provide us with the tools to achieve this important goal.

Just a personal curiosity, you mentioned the iPhone application; that clearly is one of the hottest tech gadgets out there, but what appears to be following very closely behind is the Android operating system from Google. So I'm wondering if your developers have developed an application for the Android?

JS: We would like to. See our non-profit functions on donations and someone donated the time to create the iPhone application and we haven't found anyone to donate the time to create the Android application.

DM: Well, let's make this a call. This interview is going out to hundreds of thousands of people who will listen to this, so if you or anyone listening to this knows a competent Android developer, how can they get in contact with your organization so they can develop this?

JS: Well, just contact us at info@ResponsibleTechnology.org and likewise, if people would like to make donations, we would accept that and then we can actually pay someone to do it, but right now, we're as you know with the economic downturn, a lot of non-profits have gotten smashed and we're not out of that boat, so we're treading like crazy to just get people (inaudible 38:38).

DM: Well, thanks for all you do Jeffrey. I think we've given our listeners a good start as to how they can go and make a difference. So definitely download that application and share it with your friends and family.

JS: Thank you all, and safe eating!