

## TRANSCRIPT OF 110 NOBEL LAUREATES RELEASE STATEMENT

Good morning, welcome to the National Press Club. A brief order of events, first we will hear from Dr. Richard Roberts, the 1993 Nobel Laureate in Physiology and Medicine. Next, joining us by phone we will hear from Dr. Randy Schekman the 2013 Nobel Laureate for Physiology or Medicine, followed by brief remarks by Dr. Martin Chalfie the 2008 Nobel Laureate in Chemistry. After that we will take questions. Please identify yourself by your name and organization for those joining us by live stream, and wait for the microphone to come to you before you start your question, and your affiliation. And now, it's my pleasure to introduce Dr. Richard Roberts.

**Dr. Richard Roberts:** Well, thank you and good morning everybody. I want to start off by saying, I am not a plant biologist. There is no one who actually signed this letter who is a plant biologist, but the vast majority are very good scientists, they're able to think logically, they know what is going on in the field of plant biology, for the most part, and one of the things that is absolutely clear to us is that there is almost nothing in your diet that has not been genetically modified. You know, when we first discovered agriculture and how to do it, some ten or twelve thousand years ago, we have done little to make changes. And the ideal way by which we make changes is to take two plants that are genetically as different as possible, okay, we want to find variety, we want to find things that are a long way away. The breeders figured out how to make crosses between these plants in which many genes were transferred between the plants. They would do many, many such crosses, and then, look for specific traits. This is traditional breeding.

Now, if they couldn't find the trait they wanted, they started to use tricks. As of about 100 years ago – a little over a hundred years ago. What they would do is they would take the plant and they would mutagenize it, which means you treat it to high doses of radiation, or you soak it in chemicals that introduce mutations in the DNA. Now, these mutations are not specific - they are random. They go all over the place - and then, you look and see if you have the trait you want? Is this rice growing taller than you would previously have it? Is it now at a point where it's easy to harvest? In the case of wheat, does it make sure that the grain doesn't fall over and land in the mud underneath?

And traits of this sort, and traditional breeding have been doing this probably ten or twelve thousand years, a long, long time.

Now, what happened in the 1980's was that there was a better way discovered of doing this, this was discovered by Mark Van Montague and Jeff Schell working in Belgium. And they were looking at how a bacterium, called Agrobacterium, was able to transfer DNA into plants. And they realized as soon as they found the natural mechanism that this could be used as another way of introducing other genetic variation into plants. So what they did was to work out how to do this and how to get this into plants in a fairly ordered way – a very precise way – something that I personally prefer to call precision agriculture – precise breeding rather than just GMO's because everything is a GMO.

Now, one of the things that happened as a result of all of this was that people started to think and make hay of the fact that GMO's – this method of doing it in a more precise way, was somehow considered very dangerous. But I ask you, if you compare the two methods – traditional breeding where you take hundreds of genes and pop them in between two plants....look for the products of maybe one or two genes that were useful without worrying about what else was going on, then mutagenizing if you didn't get what you wanted, does that seem to you as though it is safer than taking a precise gene – we know what it is...we put it into a plant...these days we can know exactly where it's going and we can monitor what has happened to the plant as a result of putting it in – that seems to me as just a much more sensible way of doing things. And I would like to give an analogy here - the analogy I like to use - actually there are several - but one is let us say I want to take a GPS system...I want to put a GPS system into my old car, so what do I do? Do I take a new car that has one and then just mix it...take it apart...take my old car apart mix all the components...put it back together.....and then, look and see whether the GPS went in? Or, do I simply take the GPS from my new car and affix it into my old car? Seems to me that we know the answer to that, it's obvious what you want to do, that is precision mechanics...we're talking about precision breeding where we take one gene and put it in, and we know what it is.

Another way of thinking about this, is really to think about an engineering line, a fabrication line that are making vehicles of one sort

and another. You can look in the factory and you can see all of this machinery it's all working doing its thing, but what's important is what is coming out of the far end – is it a car, or is it a tank? Two very, very different things. The method...the fabrication line is essentially the same for both. Does it matter what the fabrication line is? No. What matters is what comes out at the far end. And this is really what precision agriculture, the so-called GMO's do for you. They really allow you to be precise in what you're doing.

What happened since these methods were originally developed is we've actually learned how to do it, really very successfully and very well now, and in fact new methods are coming along all of the time, and it's just a natural extension of typical plant breeding – the breeders have found a better way of getting in the gene they want without getting in the genes that they perhaps they don't want to get in. And so, on the basis of this, people have been actually eating GMO's...they've been looking at GMO's for the longest time...all of the safety studies have proven to be very successful, there have been no well proven cases where a GMO has led to any sort of health problems whatsoever. There just not there. As opposed to say a car which has health problems all of the time.

Now, as a result of this, Greenpeace and the parties, the green parties that have been against GMO's have basically just ignored the scientific evidence, they continue to take all studies that might have been shown to have been false in some way, they promulgate them and they have made haywire out of this. They really have done tremendously well in terms of fostering their own image as a green organization. And the time has come that we now know that these things are safe. The National Academy of Sciences, here in the U.S. just put out a big report showing how safe they were. The Royal Society in England another of the most prestigious scientific establishments in the world came up with a question and answer session that's on their website showing just how safe these things are. The basic method does not lead, necessarily, to bad things. And I think this is almost true of every method you ever think of – just take the fabrication line, you know, you can make bad things on a fabrication line, or you can make good things. And GMO's are not inherently dangerous. We could engineer things, perhaps, to make them dangerous, that's not what we want to do. And so, the method itself is safe. The method is fine, it works well, we know what

we're doing, and I think the time has come when Greenpeace should just admit they made a mistake, maybe when they first got started it seemed a reasonable thing to worry about, but now we know you don't have to worry about this anymore. And I think they should admit they make a mistake and get on and do all of the wonderful things they do. They've been a fantastic organization. I've supported them in the past, but, I can't support them on this one. They should just admit they made a mistake and get on with it. So at this point I would like to hand over and see if Randy Schekman would like to say something to add to that.....

**Randy Schekman:** Yes, good morning. Good morning from California! I'm pleased to join this effort. I was delighted to sign the petition that Rich started. I've had some concerns over many years about the opposition to genetic engineering and to the use of genetic engineering for producing or improving agricultural products.

My own work is of a very basic nature...I've studied how cells manufacture protein molecules for export. I've had no direct connection to Monsanto or to any biotechnology effort to engineer plants, but I do know about the procedures that Rich described, that allowed genetically engineered organisms to be produced in the laboratory.

Golden Rice was developed by a non-profit organization called the "International Rice Research Institute" now for the purpose of supplementing Vitamin A deficient diets in the developing world. This has been an enormous health problem, blindness as a result of Vitamin A deficiency accounts for roughly a quarter of a million cases around the world, in the developing world, and it's deficiency also is estimated to lead to 2 million premature deaths. The Institute responsible for the generation of this product has made it freely available around the world. It will be specifically made available to destitute farmers, free of charge, with no profit by anybody. The genes that are responsible for the production of Beta Carotene, which is the precursor of Vitamin A, are taken and introduced into rice by these precise tools of genetic recombinant engineering that Rich described. The genes themselves that have been introduced into rice, into Golden Rice, themselves come from other agricultural products, such as corn. So, they don't come

from completely different organisms that have no reason to produce something that would be useful as a food supplement.

The concerns about the techniques of genetic engineering and recombinant DNA that Rich described, were voiced at the very outset of the recombinant DNA revolution, which began in the 1970's in the U.S. There were fears about the creation of unusual organisms that might escape from the laboratory, that they were somehow not natural. And yet, we know from 40 nearly 50 years of experience that the techniques and the application have had enormous benefit for human health. There are vast applications...the entire biotechnology industry... is based on the use of the same techniques that have now been applied to engineering plant crops. And in my case, for instance, the work that we did in my laboratory which was on a simple organism, Baker's Yeast, we were able to show that cells...yeast cells, manufacture and export protein molecules the same way that human cells do. And the biotechnology industry exploited that observation to produce recombinant human insulin...one-third of the world's supply of recombinant human insulin is made by these techniques of genetic engineering in a simple organism like yeast. So, all of those concerns that have been expressed over so many years, really have had no basis in fact in the biotechnology industry, and has been an enormous benefit to human health.

Greenpeace has questioned GMO's, specifically the Golden Rice, but there is no evidence of any problem that has emerged in the application of biotechnology to agricultural products. In fact, it's been estimated that 75% of the processed foods in the U.S. have genetically engineered ingredients – this includes 46% of the corn crop, 82% of the soybean crop, 75% of the canola. So we have enormous experience with no adverse health concerns. I am very concerned that groups such as Greenpeace prey on the sense of vulnerability that the public has, the fear of the unknown, the fear of technological development...and this has been reflected in the U.S. and the legislation to mandate labeling of foods with GMO products. Of course, people want to know what goes into their food but if they were being honest about the concerns of GMO products they would also be insisting on all of the other things that are used in agricultural procedures, pesticides, etc. So, I think the idea that we would be forced to label specifically GMO

without considering other ingredients is misplaced, and there is now legislation pending in the Senate to rationalize this process...this whole effort. So I, once again, voice my support for this and I welcome others to join in thinking rationally about how biotechnology has advanced human health, and how it could do even more so in the future of agriculture.

**Dr. Richard Roberts:** Okay, thank you Randy. Marty, would you like to say a few words?

**Dr. Marty Chalfie:** Sure, I would be happy to. I'm Marty Chalfie I'm a University Professor at Columbia University in the Department of Biological Sciences, I have a prize in Chemistry but I am biologist. I wanted to say a few things, most of which has already been said by Rich and Randy, but I wanted to say a little bit why I am one of the 109 Laureates that have signed onto this, I think there are two basic reasons. The first is I'm very worried about the procedure that groups such as Greenpeace have used to promote their agenda, which are basically in my opinion, misinformation and a development of fear. And, they have consistently ignored the scientific data, which both Rich and Randy have mentioned. And, I think that was one of the reasons, I signed and I suspect many of the other people that have signed also added their names.

The other thing is the health concerns. Just to amplify something that Randy said when he talked about human insulin, before the recombinant human insulin started to be produced, the first insulin that was given to people was derived from cows, and this lead to allergic reactions and other negative reactions to the product, this production of insulin in a more controlled way, a defined way, aided health because it didn't have these side effects. And one other.....so especially with regard to Golden Rice, when we have a clear need for a way to help so many people in the world to have this repeatedly balked by a series of changing objections. First, the objection was made that Golden Rice did not make enough Beta Carotene, and then, after it was improved to produce more Beta Carotene, suddenly it was dangerous because it was producing too much, even though the only way you could get even coming close to some sort of bad dose of this, might be to eat 20 to 40 bowls of rice, something that is not really happening in one day. All of

these things are changing arguments that are meant simply to stop something that could be really helpful for a large number of people, and that again, is the reason that I wanted to add this.

In terms of genetic....to go back to one point that Rich mentioned about we've been having genetically modified organisms for almost the entire time of agriculture in the world, I bring one that people will be enjoying all through the summer, and that's sweet corn! Sweet corn was derived because people realized they were able to get mutations and look at changes, that the reason corn was not sweet, used to be a thing when you harvested the corn, the best way to eat it was to have a pot of boiling water right next to the stalk, and that's why...and that's because when an ear of corn is picked it starts to have the starch enzymes convert the sugar to starch. So it doesn't taste sweet. And over the years, geneticists were able to derive corn such that the starch genes were not working, and when that happened suddenly there could be corn that was sweet tasting that you didn't have to eat it right in the field, you could send it off to market and then used all over the world. So we've been using genetically altered organisms for the entire time of agricultural. I think that's all I want to say at the moment. And let people ask their questions.

**Dr. Richard Roberts:** Okay, thank you Marty, before we go into questions, let me just say one other thing, that is a major driver of those of us who have signed onto this, and that is the fact that if you look around in the U.S., you look around in Europe, you don't see a lot of thin people. Food is not a major issue. We've figured out how to make enough food so that we can all eat. And so for Greenpeace to be against GMO's really didn't cost anything. It was a very easy move because if you didn't have them, it didn't matter all that much, we have an option. We can eat GMO's, we cannot... it's up to us. But the real problem is in the rest of the world. The rest of the world desperately needs these. The developing countries, very often, do not have good nutritious food, or they don't have enough food, with climate change, things are going to get worse, we're going to need crops that are drought resistant, you cannot make these quickly, by traditional breeding. It takes a long time. With GMO's we probably can make them much more quickly. And so, our concerns are not about what is going on in Europe and the U.S. It's the fact that Greenpeace are trying to spread their message to the rest

of the world, and if you think about it, they have no choice. You can't say these things are really dangerous for Europeans, but they're fine for people in sub-Saharan Africa and elsewhere in the developing world. And so, they've been going around spreading that message, and that is the thing that worries me, worries an awful lot of my colleagues, and it's something that we think should stop. Greenpeace, just admit, you made a mistake move on and get on and do some good things. So, on that let me take any questions that you might have. And I will pass the questions onto Randy or to Marty or in some cases if they get very technical about plants, then I will pass them to Nina Fedoroff who is here in the audience with us.

Please remember to give your name and affiliation.

**Penny Starr with CNS News:** Can you be more specific about what kind of dangers have been put forth with the GMO's in the Greenpeace's, I'm not familiar with it, I apologize, so I wanted to know if you could be more specific about what they're saying is dangerous and how that is not true, thank you.

**Dr. Rich Roberts:** So, one of the things that they did very early on was to say you're going to take genes out of an organism that normally would not mate with a plant. Okay....it's a fish or it's a bacterium or it's something that would not normally mate with a plant. And therefore, it must be dangerous, because otherwise the plants would already have these genes. And so, it becomes very easy to scare people. And I'm sure you have observed politicians on all sides and in all countries, this is a way in which they gain power. You scare people, and then, you say "Aha" but I will protect you from all of this danger...and in this case, we'll ban GMO's. And there are many ways in which they chose to stress what sort of dangers there might be.

Now, you could argue that in the early days maybe we didn't know enough, and maybe this was reasonable. Most biologists would have argued otherwise, but nevertheless, it was not a difficult argument to make that there might be dangers. But we've had 30 or 40 years of this now, we know that these things are safe. But apparently Greenpeace is still living back in the 80's when they first got going on all of this. And, they just need to stop it. Is that enough?

**Penny Starr:** I guess I was wondering if you could give like, because for example, the labeling of food, I wanted to know if you could say okay it's this kind of a thing that's going in into the GMO's that's dangerous.

**Dr. Richard Roberts:** The answer is No. You cannot say that there is anything going in. I can tell you an anecdote, okay, I was talking at a meeting at a local library up in Massachusetts the other day, and so, I gave a talk, a much expanded version of what I gave to you, and so, one of the ladies at the end says, well, you know now they're trying to put Salmon genes into plants. I said, well, but you know, just one gene doesn't really matter. It's a piece of DNA it will go in we can monitor it and see what's what. And she said I just don't like the idea, I don't like the thought that there's going to be a Salmon gene in. And so, I asked her, well, you know when you eat Salmon do you eat vegetables with your Salmon? Oh yeah that's perfectly okay.

And so, there is this air of irrationality that has taken place partly because the public doesn't understand it, and I think partly because we as scientists also have a little to blame. We don't do a very good job on the whole of explaining our science to the general public. There are some people who do it really well. Nina is a particularly good advocate and a good speaker. People like Neil deGrasse Tyson, does very well in terms of explaining things to the general public, but most scientists don't. They're not very good at it. They can talk in technical terms, but they can talk about the science but they have trouble talking about the general issues that really concern the nonscientist.

Do Drs. Chalfie or Schekman want to respond to that question? Go ahead Marty.

**Dr. Martin Chalfie:** So, as I mentioned before, one of the arguments about Golden Rice was that the initial argument was, well, this is going to be made for profit, this is no good. And it was given away free. And then, it was that two low levels of Beta Carotene were going to be produced. And then, it was too high levels of Beta Carotene. I should also point out that that Beta Carotene is in lots of crops. This is not a strange molecule that is being added to the plants. It is just increasing the amount that's produced, so that it can be a way of alleviating this health problem. And they sort of argued....the argument is sort of a shifting ground that's been done in terms of this.

**Dr. Randy Schekman:** I might add a couple of specific points....the genes that have been introduced into rice to make Golden Rice, one comes from corn, and the other comes from a bacterium. Our bodies have more bacterial cells than our own cells. So we've cohabited with bacteria and their genes have been mixed with us over the entire period of human evolution. So, there is nothing unnatural about the source of the genes. Indeed, rice actually makes its own Beta Carotene it's just not made in the tissue that ends up in the rice grain. So, this is all the process of introducing these genes is from entirely natural sources into a plant that produces its own Beta Carotene but now by through the advent of genetic engineering you can just make it more efficient and locate it exactly to the rice grain that's consumed.

**Dr. Richard Roberts:** Okay, that's good. Nina do you want to comment on that at all? Okay good.

**Nina Fedoroff:** I think that's all been very well covered.

**Steve Davies:** I'm with Agri-Pulse Communications. Just sort of two questions related. How did you...what prompted you to start this initiative to get signatures on the letter? And why just Greenpeace, they're certainly not the only environmental group that is made a big deal out of GMO's.

**Dr. Richard Roberts:** So, let me deal with the first one, Mark Van Montague who was one of the developers of these methods is an incredibly old friend of mine. He first started coming to Cold Spring Harbor, when I was at Cold Spring Harbor, back in the 1970's. He used to show up every few months, at the time, he was looking for some enzymes that we were isolating there called restriction enzymes. But I got to know him very well and I was aware of the story as it was developing, and it sounded terrifically exciting, but I never worked in this area and I'm just an interested on-looker, but because of our friendship I got invited to his 80<sup>th</sup> Birthday party, and so, I go to the party they have a symposium, and everybody is talking about plants, except for me, because I don't work in the field, so I had to talk about something else. But one of the things that struck me was that almost everybody I spoke to at that meeting, was saying the same thing that Greenpeace and the actions of the Green Parties in Europe were just deleterious to all of the plant research. It was difficult to get funding

anymore, if you did get labs doing it there were very often Greenpeace and other activists outside the labs demonstrating. And what was interesting is that half of the demonstrations banners would talk about GMO's. The other half would talk about Monsanto and there was this fear in Europe about big U.S. agri-business taking over the food supply.

Now of course in essence, Monsanto already had the food supply there, because they were providing all of the traditional seeds. So it was not possible to go against Monsanto as a company, you had to find a surrogate, and GMO's became the surrogate.

And I was so appalled by what I heard at this meeting, and the following day I had been invited to go and talk to European Commission about the subject at the Future of Health Care, because it's rather ironic my prize is in medicine, but I'm really a molecular biologist and now, a bio-informatician, never worked in the healthcare industry, never worked on plants, but anyway they invited me to go. And I planned to talk about where medicine might be going, but after listening to this one day symposium it occurred to me that people who don't have food don't care so much about medicine. They're main job is to get some food inside them.

And so I switched my talk and wrote a new one the night before in which I focused on the fact that food was actually the most important issue going forward, for almost all of the people in the developing world. And I gave a talk and it sort of outlined why GMO's were okay. The problems with traditional breeding is on much of the ground that I covered with you, and I got the most incredible reception because people in Europe weren't talking about it, very much. They were scared to talk about it. And this is because what Greenpeace and their allies had been doing. And I had an Italian Senator who came up to me after my talk, and she said, I had no idea and I'm going to change my mind completely. This was a lady from Italy who was in the Senate there, and a number of the staff members of the people who were at the meeting came up to me and said it was so refreshing to hear someone actually talk about this issue, in public, in Europe.

And that got me thinking that maybe there was something that I could do. And I know as do all of my fellow Laureates that because we have a Nobel Prize, people, like you in this audience here, listen to us. And you

will listen to what we say and take us seriously. And I thought maybe here is a chance for us to really do something that would be useful, in terms of trying to solve the problems that have arisen in this area. So, that was the origin of the campaign.

And the reason that we've focused on Greenpeace, and not completely, but mainly on Greenpeace is that they were the lead organization who really got into this in a major way, and then, they drew the other green parties along with them. And so, rather than sort of you know, give a list of 50 organizations that came to be green, we talk about Greenpeace as being the principle thing, because I think if Greenpeace come out and say, hey! We've made a mistake we're not going to do this, GMO's are okay, almost all of the other green parties are likely to follow them. Would the others like to say anything about that?

**Dr. Randy Schekman:** This is Randy speaking from California, I became interested in this subject long ago with the opposition to genetic manipulation when it was first voiced in the 1970's and I followed with increasing alarm particularly the GMO debate as it's played out in Europe, I think even more so than in the U.S. And what I find really hard to understand is that organizations like Greenpeace or others who oppose this, do so for a variety of reasons, based on technology or technological development, and yet, and they do so in spite of the nearly unanimous support of scientists around the world who work on biotechnology and who do basic science, and understand the procedures, and understand the applications. They are willing, in that case to dismiss the views of the vast majority of scientists, whereas, in other issues they embrace the views of scientists who support an understanding the role of human intervention in global climate change, or the views of scientists who support vaccinations in human health.

So, what I fail to understand is their acceptance of science and the scientific process when it serves their purposes to do so. But their opposition when reasons that are really hard for me to understand they oppose the view of scientists. So, when Rich offered me the opportunity to join this petition I was delighted to do so.

**Dr. Martin Chalfie:** I would second what Randy said, I think all of us that use genetic engineering in our work, which is virtually all molecular biologists, have been aware of this issue for a very long time. For me, it

was really brought home by Rich's discussion of this to me. I heard him talk at a meeting and brought home some of the examples that I had not known about, as well. And then, there was a very nice article last year in Slate by William Saletan last July that also documented quite a number of problems with the anti-GMO campaign, and together this sparked my interest a great deal, and got me more involved in this.

**Dr. Richard Roberts:** There is actually a link to the Slate article on our website.

**Joshua Ramirez:** With Talk Media News, thank you for having me here this morning. I just have a question, earlier you stated that there was not any plant biologists on the list, do you guys have any concern about that? And also, are there any plant biologists currently speaking out for or against?

**Dr. Richard Roberts:** So, I can take a quick grasp at that, and then, I'll hand that over to Nina because I think she can tell you why the plant biologists are not speaking out even better than I can. Greenpeace has intimidated the plant biologists, and so most of them just don't want to say anything publically, and that was why I thought a campaign in which respected scientists who understand the science and can think scientifically and logically stood a much better chance of getting the message through to the public, and hopefully perhaps we can convince the plant biologists to sort of now "come out" as it were, and join the campaign and start to speak openly again, but Nina can tell you much more about the history, I'm sure.

**Nina Fedoroff:** Well, I think it's not true that plant biologists don't speak out, many of us, including me, have been speaking out for going on 40 years. I've written a book about it, published by the National Academy of Sciences, titled "Mendel in the Kitchen – A Scientist View of Genetically Modified Organisms." More specifically on the issue of Golden Rice, in I believe it was 2013, when the rice trials in the Philippines were uprooted by what we suspect was driven by Greenpeace a number of us started a petition that collected...worldwide petition that collected signatures of 6,000 scientists, including many, many Nobel Prize winners, I bet if I look back Rich probably signed it. And we published an opinion piece in science magazines titled "Standing Up for GMO's" that was again, signed by several Nobel Prize winners

and people who are prominent in breeding and genetic modification. So many of us have been speaking up over, and over, and over again and we make some progress. I should also note that about the time the trials were being ripped up, Amy Harmon of the New York Times wrote a perfectly exquisite article about the GMO controversy. I recommend it to everyone. I think it's probably still obtainable if you just do Amy Harmon and Golden Rice.

So, there's a lot...I think that what you're referring to Rich is that in about the last couple of years there's a little organization called U.S. Right To Know – USRTK, which was started by an individual who was not successful in pushing the labeling issue through in California, then began to use the Freedom of Information Act to obtain all of the emails that academic scientists have exchanged with bio-tech companies, and of course, this was at public universities. And, one of them, a very articulate outspoken by the name of Kevin Fulton, University of Florida, was so hounded as a result of the misconstrual of his emails that he received death threats. And in the last couple of days, his office was broken into, it's really intimidation tactics. Now, we have started a legal defense fund for these folks, and we would be delighted to have anybody contribute to that. Okay, so I can go on for a long time but this is not my press conference.

**Dr. Martin Chalfie:** Can I add something to what's been said? This is Marty, the question was why are there no plant people on the letter, I don't believe there are any living Nobel Laureates at the moment that have worked on plants.

**Dr. Richard Roberts:** Let me add one thing there, there are actually several Laureates who have connections into the agri-business and agri-industry and they deliberately excluded themselves from signing this letter so that they would not bring any sort of taint associated with industrial connections.

This would be a good time to mention, as well, if anyone wants to sign the letter they can go to [Support Precision Agriculture.org](http://SupportPrecisionAgriculture.org) that's anyone listening as well. We have time for one more question, and then, the three Laureates would be available for interviews if you want to talk to us afterwards.

**Dr. Richard Roberts:** Let's put it this way, I think many of the people who signed would like to be Nobel Laureates.

(laughing)

Thank you for coming, again, if you would like to talk to any of the Laureates they're available for comment and interviews if you talk to us after this.

**Dr. Richard Roberts:** And I would be happy to talk to anybody if you would just get in touch with me contact me, I am happy to talk to you about this issue, because this is an issue that it's no good just scientists talking to scientists about it, we've got to get the message out to the general public. It's the only way we're ever going to make an impact here. Okay, thank you all for coming.

**END OF VIDEO.**