More than 100 Nobel-winning scientists have hit back at campaigners like Greenpeace, claiming the new advances will help fight world hunger



Genetically modified <u>food</u> is back under the spotlight and I have to admit, I've never been against it.

Nature itself changes the genes in plants to produce "natural" GM foods. Plus, explosive increases in the world's population means such advances are needed to fight famine.

Now 109 eminent Nobel laureates have told us to stop GMO-bashing too.

They have posted a letter online saying: "Greenpeace has spearheaded opposition to Golden Rice, which has the potential to reduce or eliminate much of the death and disease caused by a vitamin A deficiency, which has the greatest impact on the poorest people in Africa and southeast Asia."

How can anyone fly in the face of preventing starvation? Not me.

I agree with the proponents of genetically modified foods such as Golden Rice, which contains genes from corn and a bacterium, when they argue they're a source of essential nutrients.



Greenpeace has accused corporations of over-hyping Golden Rice

Greenpeace counter that argument by saying that corporations are over-hyping Golden Rice to pave the way for global approval of other more profitable genetically engineered crops.

To set the record straight, Richard J Roberts, one of two winners of the 1993 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine, spearheaded the letter writing.

He said: "There's been a tremendous amount of misinformation put out by Greenpeace."

And he added that some plant scientists had been attacked so fiercely over their views that they have gone silent.

In the letter, the laureates – all but 10 of who earned their prizes for physics, chemistry or medicine – contend that genetically modified organisms have consistently been found to be safe.

They wrote: "Scientific and regulatory agencies around the world have consistently found crops and foods improved through biotechnology to be as safe as, if not safer than those derived from any other method of production.



World hunger is still a tragic problem

"There has never been a single confirmed case of a negative health outcome for humans or animals from their consumption. Their environmental impacts have been shown repeatedly to be less damaging to the environment, and a boon to global biodiversity."

In 2014, the Pew Research Center, in Washington, D.C, US, found a huge gap in understanding and viewpoints between the public and scientists on this issue.

One in four people in the US said GM foods were safe to eat, while nine out of 10 scientists connected to the American Association for the Advancement of Science said the same.

Science convinces me, not opinion nor emotional arguments.