

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 8 August 2017 2:38 PM
To: submissions
Subject: FSANZ Submission Form Received (Internet) - personal



Code Submission

Application/Proposal Number:	A1138
Organisation Name:	personal
Organisation Type:	Individual
Representing:	self
Street Address:	[REDACTED]
Postal Address:	[REDACTED]
Contact Person:	Igor Kardailsky
Contact Number:	[REDACTED]
Email Address:	[REDACTED]
Submission Text:	I wholeheartedly support this application, as a

knowledgeable plant biologist, and as a concerned global citizen. There are no scientifically determined risks. As shown in the supporting documents, the only newly engineered enzymatic component is safe in animal trials at doses >100,000 that what would be expected in humans consuming the golden rice, and all the new proteins are shown to be rapidly degraded by cooking and digestion. There are no new metabolites detected in transgenic rice, except the ones expected when the carotenes/provitamin A are made. There is no added environmental risks on farm: no glyphosate application, or other selective new chemical, is required to grow it. There is no global corporal entity with its greedy agenda behind it. Given this, even minimal good coming from golden rice would justify its acceptance. And here we are talking about saving or improving lives of as much as 20% of very young children living in the third world!

The only objections to the proposal will probably be coming from religious opinions. To clarify, there are those who adhere to the new age pagan view of Mother Earth/Mother Nature as a suffering deity whose soul is manifested/connected to the genetic code of its innocent creatures and plants. It is therefore sacrilegious and violent for dirty blaspheming humans to dare tinker with the 'genes'. I think that this sentiment, while not usually willingly expressed or acknowledged, is essentially the only 'reason' that may be behind opposition to this proposal. It may get dressed as environmental concern (for which there is no reason here), or as a biodiversity concern (again, no reason in this particular application), or generally vague fear of unintended consequences. The last one is essentially an ancient human fear of wrath of offended deities. What makes it worse is that such views are expressed by those in the first

world who usually feel entitled to their plate of organically grown cereal-based meal. Had they chosen the conventional option, there could have been two plates produced with the same inputs, but they don't seem to mind to take that extra plate away from someone else in the world who may need it a lot more. They wouldn't mind if serving their personal (unscientific, essentially religious) views will leave millions of kids suffering from near-blindness. I hope reason and enlightenment will prevail in assessing this application.