

The Upcoming Degree in GMOs - Episode 63 - Transcript

Jim Turner (00:08)

Welcome to Citizens for Health radio. We are talking today to Jeffrey Smith, who is the premier consumer advocate on the issue on the health problems of genetically engineered food and just in general the whole area. Jeffrey has been working in this area for the past over 20 years--almost 25 years, actually. In that time, Citizens for Health has been an ally of his activities, working to bring to the attention of the American public and American consumers the kinds of risks that are built into the whole area of genetically modified foods and other products, in fact. Jeffrey, I'd like to welcome you into the program and I'm going to ask you to give just a very quick thumbnail sketch of your organization and what you do with that organization.

Jeffrey Smith: 01:03

Thank you, Jim. I'm with the Institute for Responsible Technology and the Institute for Responsible Technology.org and we have been pioneering the creation of the expressions and information that accurately characterize the health dangers of GMOs and the corrupt approval process and disinformation that has allowed these products to get on the market.

Jeffrey Smith: (01:29)

I started this 24 years ago in terms of my studying and educational efforts. At that time, not only did hardly anyone know what a GMO was, but the nonprofits that were involved in advocacy, or not focusing on the health dangers, our opinion was that the health dangers would be the primary lever by which we could drive the GMO foods off the market, and that, in fact, is what's happening. There's now 51% of Americans think that GMOs are unsafe. 48% of people worldwide think that GMOs are unsafe. That accurate opinion is now driving the food companies to eliminate GMOs in order to meet consumer demand, and that is been a great success of ours. However, as we'll talk about with the new GMO 2.0 technologies, decisions made in supermarkets by consumers will not stop the genetic engineering of microbes, trees, insects, grass, etc. and we need to change our campaign strategies in order to protect against what is truly an existential threat in the world.

Jim Turner: (02:43)

Jeff, I think before we get into the existential threat, maybe you could take just a couple of minutes and summarize the health dangers of genetically modifying food and other living products.

Jeffrey Smith: (02:59)

Thank you, this is something that I have done in so many different ways. A couple of years ago I released a film called "Secret Ingredients" with Amy Hart, which describes how individuals switched to organic food: they get better from a variety

of diseases and disorders. What's interesting is that these were not one-offs. The children who are autistic that are no longer on the spectrum; the infertile couples that have kids; the people who had cancer and skin conditions and brain fog and digestive issues.

Jeffrey Smith: (03:35)

The doctors in the film describe how these are typical responses in their patients that they put on organic foods all the time, and they put thousands of patients on organic food. In fact, at about 160 lectures I asked audiences to tell the rest of us what they noticed they got better from when they switched to non-GMO and organic food, and the list was extensive. The number one most common result was improved digestive capacity and getting over digestive problems. We then replicated the survey with 3,256 people, and they confirmed they had got better from the same 28 conditions in the same relative frequency that I saw in the lectures. There were digestive problems, fatigue, brain fog, weight problems, anxiety, allergies, food sensitivity, cardiovascular problems, diabetes, autism, infertility, liver conditions, kidney conditions--extensive. We look at three reasons why GMOs may be causing these problems.

Jeffrey Smith: (04:50)

One is the fact that most GMOs are engineered to be sprayed with herbicides, particularly Roundup Ready crops created by Monsanto, purchased by Bayer. Their Roundup Ready crops are designed to be sprayed with Roundup herbicide. The Roundup residues get into the food and that can cause all sorts of problems that basically damage the foundation of every aspect of our health and the microbiome and mitochondria, the neurotransmitters and the hormones. The cell structure produces cancer and birth defects, etc. But even without the Roundup, studies have shown that the generic process of genetic engineering creates all sorts of organ damage, smaller organs, premature death, tumors, cancer, etc. and immune system problems. You have a situation where the generic process of swapping genes or adding genes into a DNA causes massive collateral damage and side effects. You have the herbicide sprayed on the crops causing problems. And then you have another class of GMOs that produced their own insecticide, which is designed to drill holes in the guts of insects to kill them.

Jeffrey Smith: (06:04)

It turns out in a Petri dish in a laboratory, that same insecticide that you're eating in genetically engineered corn can drill holes in human cells. The study in Canada shows that 93% of the pregnant women tested had the BT toxin in their blood, possibly passing through holes in the intestines that it itself created. These are just some of the issues. Basically we believe that GMOs and Roundup comprise perhaps the single most pervasive health issue on the planet, or certainly in the United States. We have correlative evidence suggesting that it is driving up at least 30 diseases that are rising in parallel with the increased use of GMOs and Roundup in the American diet.

Jim Turner: (06:50)

Tell me where the audience can find this information online. If you have something that you can direct them to so they can read, for example, the list of ailments that you're turning up as being affected by GMOs.

Jeffrey Smith: (07:03)

Yes, I do. If you go to responsibletechnology.org, we have several categories where you can explore information. I published a peer reviewed study based on the survey at the *International Journal of Human Nutrition and Functional Medicine*, where the list of the 28 conditions is there. In addition, we do have, I believe in our resource section I believe, a Power Point you can download that has the charts of about 30 conditions that we have correlated with the increased use of GMOs and Roundup. Correlation does not prove causation, but in the context where we can identify the very specific modes of action of GMOs, Roundup and BT toxin, that would lead to predictably those same diseases. Because individuals, humans, and pets and livestock appear to get better from those same conditions when they switched to non GMO and organic, we are very confident that it's not just a correlation but it is, in fact, a causation.

Jim Turner: (08:08)

Now what we're saying, as I understand it (and Citizens for Health is involved as a partner on this issue) is that individuals who can choose, for example, organic food, will improve their health by avoiding these GMO items. Is that a fair statement to say to our consumers?

Jeffrey Smith: (08:29)

Yes. What happens is when you eat organic, you eat products that are not allowed to contain genetically modified ingredients, or products that have been sprayed with Roundup herbicide and other chemical pesticides. This is the best thing we can do if we don't grow our own or know our sources of food intimately. If you just get non-GMO, the problem is...let's say you get a non-GMO bowl of oatmeal. Oatmeal has never been genetically engineered, however oats--like most of the grains in this country and also in many other countries--are sprayed with Roundup just before harvest to dry down the crop. It's sprayed three to five days before harvest, and it gets synthesized in the plant in such a way that it gets deposited in the food portion. If you eat a bowl of oatmeal that's not organic, you're getting a huge dose of glyphosate, the chief poison in Roundup that has just been the subject of three trials in the last couple of years, where it was identified as the cause of cancer in four plaintiffs.

Jeffrey Smith: (09:40)

Monsanto/Bayer is trying to settle with 125,000 more plaintiffs who got non-

Hodgkin's lymphoma. That's just one of many diseases linked to the glyphosate in your oatmeal. If you eat hummus or other beans, you will also get a big dose of glyphosate based on the research that we looked at, unless it's organic. Also, at responsibletechnology.org you can sign up for updates, and when you do you will receive a report that has all the testing data of all the different foods that have been tested in the United States and Canada with the levels of glyphosate. The US government refuses to do this research on glyphosate because they've been friends with Monsanto for decades. They do it with all the other pesticides, but not with Roundup. So we've had to compile all the different independent studies so people can know what to avoid. But the easiest way to avoid it, Jim, is to simply eat organic, which doesn't allow the intentional use of these dangerous components.

Jim Turner: (10:49)

Now you mentioned the various ways that this regulatory process is operating in such a way that it doesn't actually protect us. If you'll go into a little bit of that explanation...

Jeffrey Smith: (11:01)

The first Bush administration was convinced--probably by Monsanto--that GMOs would increase U.S. exports and US domination of the trade of food in the world. And so the Council of Competitiveness, led by Dan Quayle, basically announced that they wouldn't be regulating and slowing down the production of genetically engineered foods. Two days later the Food and Drug Administration announced this hands-off policy, that no GMOs needed to be tested or labeled, and that companies like Monsanto could introduce their foods into the market without even telling the FDA. It turns out that the person who was in charge of that policy at the FDA was Michael Taylor, Monsanto's former attorney, later Monsanto's vice-president, later the foods tsar under Obama. The claim in the policy that was the justification for non-regulation was that the agency wasn't aware of any information showing that GMOs were significantly different. When documents were made public from a lawsuit in 1999, it turns out that was a fraud. The overwhelming consensus among the scientists working at the FDA was exactly the opposite, stated as such. They were concerned that GMOs could create allergens, toxins, new diseases, and nutritional problems, and urged the government, to require these products to be tested even in human clinical trials and toxicological tests. However, they were overruled, and to this day none of the major tests that they had asked for at the time were done. However, their concerns have been validated, based on the evidence that we're compiling.

Jim Turner: (12:46)

What was the effect on the world trade issue for food? Did the American share of the world trade in food go up?

Jeffrey Smith: (12:55)

No, it went down significantly, because the U.S. was trying to push GMO soy and corn on the world, and it was flatly rejected. So the exports dropped, the prices, dropped, the subsidies increased dramatically. And then they decided to go around the world and try and force other countries to accept the GMOs, and that became a further disaster. Right now, even within the United States, the most major food companies are in the process of converting their GM ingredients to non-GMO, because they realized that when their competitor says non-GMO on the same shelf in the supermarket, they get a bump in sales because now we've been able to educate consumers about the significant health dangers.

Jim Turner: (13:46)

The way that you've described the situation so far, it sounds like the issue is resolved and we're going to be on the downside and we're just wrapping things up. But earlier you said we're facing a significant existential crisis at this moment on genetically modified products. Would you explain that crisis?

Jeffrey Smith: (14:04)

Well, first of all, we're not completely out of the woods in terms of the dangers of the food. It is being worked on, because we have achieved a tipping point in the marketplace. It is being ushered out more and more. But, you may have heard of CRISPR, of course you have. CRISPR is a gene editing technique that is so cheap and easy you can do it in the comfort of your own home with a do-it-yourself kit from Amazon for \$169. And when you do that, you're creating a new organism that was never part of the billions of years of evolution. And if you were to release an organism that can survive in the wild and it reproduces, then what you've done is you've changed the gene pool. Now, if you imagine being around in 1859 in Australia on Christmas day, you may have witnessed them releasing 24 rabbits so that the settlers from the UK could feel more at home because they could hunt the rabbits.

Jeffrey Smith: (15:02)

Now that shortsighted release resulted in about 10 billion rabbits populating Australia by the 1920s. That's one species in one ecosystem that has caused at this point around \$600 million of damage per year and countless changes in the ecosystem. Imagine replacing every species in an ecosystem with a new one based on genetic engineering, and using a technology that is prone to side effects. Although the biotech industry saw the demise of consumer confidence in GMOs, they decided to try and sell their new gene editing as safe and predictable, even though there's more than a dozen peer reviewed published studies that show that it is generically just the opposite--that it doesn't do what it's supposed to do, that it makes consistent surprise side effects, massive collateral damage, and can turn a harmless food into a deadly one. We're in a situation now where everything with DNA is being targeted by a company, a scientist, or a government, for manipulation.

Jeffrey Smith: (16:17)

We could see a day where hundreds of thousands of GMOs would be released into the environment of all different species, ultimately replacing nature with a corrupted gene pool. Now, Jim, I can't overemphasize the ticking time bomb associated with this, and I'll use two examples to make my point. In the 1990s, there was a genetically engineered bacterium called *Klebsiella plant Piccolo*, and it was two weeks away from being released, when fortunately a graduate student who was doing research on this particular genetically engineered bacterium discovered that it rendered soil incapable of growing terrestrial plants. Now, Dr. Elaine Ingram, who was the advisor of this graduate student, said that if this bacterium had been released two weeks later, it could have--as other bacteria has demonstrated in other studies--traveled around the world with no ability to recall it. If it had replaced the natural counterpart, *Klebsiella plant Pickler*, it could have rendered terrestrial plants obsolete, incapable of growing on the planet.

Jeffrey Smith: (17:41)

That would be a cataclysm of an existential threat that would completely wipe out humans and species, etc. --maybe not completely, but I don't want to go there. And that was not the only bacterium that was nearly released that could have had widespread damage. A few years before that there was a bacterium that was attempted to be released that could have theoretically changed the weather patterns, because it could have theoretically replaced its natural counterpart, which when airborne, causes water or moisture to form into rain and snow and sleet. And they wanted to genetically engineer it--in fact, they did so that it wouldn't do that, because if it was sprayed on strawberries or potatoes it would protect from frost damage. So in both cases, well-meaning scientists had plans for their bacteria--in one case to protect crops, and another place to help farmers turn their crop residues into alcohol to run their tractors and to spread the sludge onto the fields as fertilizer.

Jeffrey Smith: (18:45)

If they had gotten to that stage and spread that sludge and that bacterium had gotten out, it could have been a cataclysm. That's just two species, just two. And we're talking about the possibility of this generation targeting every known species. By 2025, we will have the genome of 1.2 million identified species. Once those are available, as you know, there are scientists that do what scientists do. They tinker well-meaning-- let's fix things. Yet most of them are very unaware of what very few scientists are completely aware of, and that is that the technology is dangerous. It leads to unpredicted side effects. It should never be used in organisms that are released outside, and certainly not in the food supply.

Jim Turner: (19:40)

What is the individual consumer able to do in the face of CRISPR? How can they protect themselves?

Jeffrey Smith: (19:49)

There's two ways. First of all, eating organic is very, very important.

Jim Turner: (19:54)

Is CRISPR kept out of organic?

Jeffrey Smith: (19:55)

It is at this point, yes. It's also kept out of the non-GMO Project Verified products. They have to monitor very carefully the new technologies and who has what. If you see organic seals, if you see the non-GMO Project verification butterfly, both of those are designed to be a barrier. But some of these things are getting on the market and no one knows about it because the U.S. government has been convinced, like many governments, to pay no attention to the man behind the curtain-- to take anything that's gene edited and say, not our problem. So a mushroom maker sent a letter, as others have, to the USDA that said, you don't really have to regulate our mushrooms because its gene edited. They said, no, we don't. And it turns out they used the technology CRISPR, and they did it in a way where they believed it would knock out a gene that caused damage or browning when the mushroom was sliced. We now know that that same technique doesn't always work and can create proteins that could be harmful or even deadly, and it was probably never checked.

Jim Turner: (21:03)

Let us take a break here for a moment. When we come back I want to continue this conversation, and I also want you to introduce some kind of an understanding of the recent Nobel Prize that went to people who were working in this field, and how that recognition affects the kinds of projects and efforts that you are undertaking in your activities. So you are listening to the Citizens for Health. You are listening to Jeffrey Smith, who was the premier consumer advocate spokesman on the health damages of genetic genetically modified foods. I'm Jim Turner board chair of Citizens for Health, and this is the Citizens for Health program...

Welcome back to the Citizens for Health radio program. We're talking with Jeffrey Smith, who was the premier consumer advocate on the health dangers of genetically modified foods. And we're discussing what Jeffrey has called the existential threat that is occurring from new technologies in the area of modifying the gene nature of foods and plants and other living substances--anything living. Jeffrey, you had said there were two ways that consumers could protect themselves and you gave us one. Just remind us what the first one was, and then tell us the second one.

Jeffrey Smith: (22:20)

Well, the first is to eat organic or products that are Non-GMO Project Verified. Of course, if you eat Non-GMO Project Verified, it still might be sprayed with Roundup, so organic is the way to go. And if you see organic and Non-GMO Project Verified on the same package, that would be called the gold standard, because there's a few regulations and requirements that the Project has that organic doesn't, it would be nice. Now the other way is to support the effort to protect nature from being replaced. We have a website called Protect Nature Now. There's a three-minute video that basically describes this existential threat. Soon we will have a trailer for a short film that we're going to release in early 2021 which will launch a global movement. I mentioned earlier that we've been massively successful in driving consumer opinions and behavior on GMOs, but in this case we need to change the policies, the regulatory environment, the understanding. We need it to be understood throughout the world.

Jeffrey Smith: (23:32)

School children and Nobel Prize winners alike, we have arrived at the inevitable time in human history when we can redirect the streams of evolution for all time. With this we have the capacity to harm all living beings and all future generations, so we need to look at our role with a bigger lens as the stewards of all living beings and all future generations. We need to understand that we must lock this technology down in its infant state, or it can do far worse than the rabbits released in Australia in 1859. We're looking at our very existence. So we are mounting a global campaign for education and for regulatory change. I would like to invite everyone to protectnaturenow.com to do two things: one, to subscribe so we can keep you informed and especially give you the information about our coming launch of the movement in early 2021. For those that can, please donate to the cause, because as you can imagine we need a lot of money to protect this planet, because given the technology, any single nation or transnational corporation can mess it up for all of us. We know from COVID-19 that one microbe, whether GMO-ed or not, can wreak havoc around the planet. If you genetically engineer microbes, then you increase the likelihood of that type of thing and also massive environmental dangers, and so we need to act quickly.

Jim Turner: (25:10)

I'm interested...you're talking about getting an awareness going for the public, and I know that a Nobel Prize was recently given in science that affects this entire argument. Would you describe that and explain how it fits into what you're attempting to do here?

Jeffrey Smith: (25:30)

Yes, the two scientists--women, one from France and one from United States--discovered gene technologies tool CRISPR CAS9 that we're talking about making gene editing so cheap and easy. Now this is akin to Madam Curie's Nobel Prize in discovering basically the ability to use in a *foster radiation*,[??] where it developed the ability for X-rays and atom bombs. Here we have the ability to do more precise edits of the genome and have collateral damage at the same time, and have mistakes and pick up random pieces of DNA, etc. etc. We can go into that for half an hour and everyone would be totally convinced that this is an extremely imprecise and dangerous technology--and it's very useful for scientists doing research. It can be used to help individuals that have defects in their genome and repair them in a way that it doesn't get inherited, so we're not changing humanity, just protecting one person from a particular defective gene.

Jeffrey Smith: (26:45)

And what it also does--and this was something that was mentioned by the Swedish Academy--it basically allows us to redirect evolution and what's not being calculated. It's simple arithmetic. People are thinking in terms of changing one

specific item, one specific gene in one specific organism in one specific species. If you widened the look at this capacity of CRISPR CAS9, we're talking about the possibility of eliminating the products of the billions of years of evolution, so that all future generations never get what we had. Instead they inherit the products of laboratory creations, with side effects. So it's a very interesting two-edge sword, and it's not something that's actually even controversial once you realize the arithmetic. And if you think about it, how is it possible they can replace nature? First of all, anyone could be a genetic engineer. The products are going to become cheaper and more powerful. And the larger corporations are combining artificial intelligence with robotics, filling facilities with robots that can create genes at impressive speeds, allowing them to create thousands of different combinations that can ultimately be released. This is where we need to slow down our commercialization of a new technology in favor of life.

Jim Turner: (28:25)

What mechanism do we have that can slow down that movement? What tools are there available to engage in getting control of this technology and having it produce only the best benefits and eliminate all of the risks?

Jeffrey Smith: (28:42)

You know, years ago when GMOs were just being looked at for the first time, a bunch of scientists got together and decided on their own to lock it down. They realized they were being given unprecedented capacity to affect the nature of species forever, and they agreed no GMO should be released out of the laboratory. But certain scientists and commercial interests in a very, very well-documented fraud, lied to the public and lied to politicians, claiming that they had solved the basic problems of predictability and safety--which they hadn't--which allowed the industry to move forward.

Jim Turner: (29:25)

Jeffrey, let me just jump in there and say...clarify this for me...my understanding is that the scientists who came together and wrote the guidelines for not releasing GMOs to the market—ah, let us save this. We're going to have to take a break now. Jeffrey, I'll give you the question. You can think about it during the break. But the idea I was getting at is they were somewhat effective in the pharmaceutical industry in controlling some of the GMO type activities, but it was completely eliminated from the food industry. That's my understanding. Think about that, clarify for me if I'm not correct or express more on it, and then we can continue with your previous answer.

This is Jim Turner. I'm Board Sheriff Citizens for Health. You are listening to the Citizens for Health radio program.

Jim Turner: (30:14)

And have Jeffrey Smith, who was the country's leading consumer advocate on the dangers of genetically modifying food and other living products.

Welcome back to Citizens for Health, the radio program. I'm Jim Turner, the Board Chair of Citizens for Health. I'm an attorney in Washington, DC, worked for years in the food safety area. And we have Jeffrey Smith, who is the country's leading consumer advocate on the health dangers of genetically modifying food and other living products. We're in the middle of discussing the dangers that the various kinds of genetic modification tools present and are addressing that problem.

Jeffrey, I had just asked you what kinds of tools do we have to manage the new technology CRISPR, and the ability that it has to be both positive and negative. How do we get the best and stop the worst of this food technology?

Jeffrey Smith: (31:20)

Well, I think regulation is one. Another one is the institutional review boards around the world. They are the committees that approve specific research study designs at universities. They need to be alerted that they cannot allow any release of genetically engineered organisms into the environment. We need liability laws. We need strict liability...these preventions of release. Imagine, for example, that a state or a particular country, or even a county says, there are no genetically engineered organisms to be released here. And if your organism comes into our jurisdiction, then there are strict penalties. You need to remediate, you need to pay, have them have the liability-- for anything that happens that's a problem, you have to pay for it. Now, let's say they're talking about a microbe, bacteria or virus or fungus. You can't control those once they're released. They can travel anywhere.

Jeffrey Smith: (32:27)

In the same way that U.S. farmers and the U.S. farm industry refused to commercialize genetically engineered corn varieties that hadn't been approved in the major export markets like China--they waited until it was approved--imagine that you are the company Joyn Bio, which is trying to create and release genetically engineered microbes for farmers. If they realize that there's a state that doesn't allow it and that they would have to remediate if there was cross boundaries, then they would hesitate to release it. So we have to do strict liability, we have to do prevention laws, and we have to also do massive education. And it has to be part of popular culture, because in my experience giving talks in 45 countries, I can work with a government. I've even been flown to a government, you know, for example by Poland. They flew me there to give a press conference with the environment minister.

Jeffrey Smith: (33:28)

I praised their strong anti -MO stance and food and seed. A week later an election replaced them with a pro-GMO government. I worked with the government of Thailand, same thing. They were against GMOs to release them into fields for field

trials, and then two weeks later it was a new government that was pro-GMO. So we can't base the future of our planet just on politics. We need to engrain this understanding as an understanding that every school child realizes that our civilization has a new mandate because we have a new technology.

Jim Turner: (34:10)

Well, the first thing I have for you is does the ability to buy this thing for \$135, and doing it in your home pose any kind of danger to the environment in general?

Jeffrey Smith: (34:23)

You know, I haven't analyzed the specific bacteria and the five different ways that you can genetically engineer it with the do-it-yourself kit. I haven't had a chance to sit down with a scientist to look at what could go wrong. But I'm actually more concerned about the future of the do-it-yourself kits. For \$2,000, biohackers can create gene editing laboratories in their basement and have all sorts of access where you can buy specific things in mail order for 40 or 60 bucks, and do yet another gene editing operation creating a new organism: gene editing--try it on your own DNA. It's becoming accessible in a way that is astounding, and the amount of genomic information that's going to be available in the next 10 years--we'll basically have libraries of the genomes of every species available to us, which means that anyone with a computer and a little bit of bioinformatics can go in there and start tinkering and then call in, or do mail order to order certain genomic combinations that will be put together by robots driven by artificial intelligence with no human intervention, delivered to your door.

Jeffrey Smith: (35:48)

So now we're in a situation where not only everyone has access to new species, but there's even a technology called Gene Drives, where you force traits into all offspring, not just half of the offspring that's typical, but you can wipe out entire species, change the characteristics of entire species. The Department of Defense is genetically engineering insects to deliver viruses so the genetic engineering takes place in the field.

Jim Turner: (36:20)

You mean as a bioweapon?

Jeffrey Smith:

Well, they don't say they're doing it as a bioweapon. It's not finished yet. It's called Hegas -- H E G A S, but it's going on. And the biotech industry is also creating sprays for pesticides that are actually RNA, that change gene expression of plants and insects, and if you get that spray on your skin, it might reprogram the expression of your DNA. They're going from genetically modified organisms to genetically modified ecosystems.

Jeffrey Smith: (36:52)

So you see, Jim, nothing is sacred when everything is your playground and has a dollar figure associated with a potential outcome. There was a mantrum among the biotech industry that it is safe and predictable, and anyone who's demanding more science is actually anti-science. That misinformation has allowed this thing to explode. We need to get the real information, out there so that everyone puts the brakes on or realizes, wait a minute, this is not ready for prime time. We are giving children atom bombs. We are giving biological time bombs to anyone in this way. We need to withdraw that with mandates and strict liability and a deep understanding embedded into popular culture from now on.

Jim Turner: (37:42)

Walk through and tick off exactly what individuals can do to contribute to achieving the outcome of having this new technology controlled, so that its benefits can be utilized and its risks eliminated.

Jeffrey Smith: (37:58)

We're involved in identifying just those questions, just those answers. We have a program we're going to launch early next year. We're looking at the legal remedies or looking at the legislative remedies. We're looking at the educational remedies-- what people can do if they're a university student, what people can do if they're a consumer. So I can't answer that question right now, and in fact, I don't really want to yet, because most everything that I do gets monitored by the biotech industry. I don't mind them knowing everything that I've said so far, but when it comes to deeper strategy, I'm going to wait until the release in early 2021. I encourage everyone to go to protectnaturenow.com to subscribe so that you also can be part of this absolutely necessary global movement that will win. We will be able to protect nature now I'm extremely confident.

Jim Turner: (38:55)

Let's just step back one level and ask you how hopeful you are that we can actually overcome this existential threat.

Jeffrey Smith: (39:05)

Well, I actually think I'm very confident and it's interesting. I'm doing another summit called "A Magnificent New Normal," where I'm interviewing 40 thought leaders about where we're going after this pandemic, and even from indigenous prophecies and the understanding of the new science of consciousness. I feel like this whole "lockdown in place" is actually a springboard for us to act differently as a civilization, and this fits perfectly into this as an antidote.

Jim Turner: (39:39)

Well, thank you very much, Jeffrey. We really look forward to seeing what you are able to generate. Your successes in the GMO area that's led to having consumers be much more aware will be created by what you're doing here, in my estimation. I think going down the paths of the tech you've sketched out here will be very, very valuable in getting us to grapple with and control the benefits of these new technologies while eliminating their risks.

Jim Turner: (40:09)

Jeffrey, we're going on a break now for my final announcement and I thank you very, very much for being with us here today. Jeffrey Smith, who's the country's leading proponent, and consumer advocate of how to control and utilize GMO technologies in a way that will be helpful rather than harmful. He's been an ally, we've been an ally with him as Citizens for Health from the beginning and we look forward to joining again further moving this whole issue into a way that consumers can cope with it effectively. I am Jim Turner, the Board Chair of Citizens for Health, am very happy to talk with you, Jeffrey, and look forward to our next encounter. And I look forward to seeing your presentations that you've talked about coming on board. And thank you for being with us.

.....

Jeffrey Smith: (41:06)

Thank you for listening to Live Healthy - Be Well. Please subscribe to the podcast, using whatever app you listen to podcasts with. Or go to live.healthybewell.com to subscribe. This podcast will inform you about health dangers, corporate and government corruption, and ways we can protect ourselves, our families and our planet. I interview scientists, experts, authors, whistleblowers, and many people who have not shared their information with the world until now. Please share the podcast with your friends. It will enlighten and may even save lives

Safe Eating