Industrial foods; cause of diseases or not argumentative essay

Business, Customers

\n[toc title="Table of Contents"]\n

\n \t

\n[/toc]\n \n

Industrial Food makes many Diseases

As the world seeks to achieve food security, food production has been enhanced and technological methods are now used to develop methods of production, or serve as factors of production. This has led to several terms that are in common use today about food production. There has been regular debate on the viability and safety of naturally adjusted foods and organisms. This has further led to search of the food production processes and entirely the industrial processes that are involved in production of food; right from the raw sources to the finished product meant for consumption (Deiner, 2012). This debate has led to the motivation shown by several food agencies towards upholding that the world populace feeds on safe foods. Importance has been laid on food quality and food safety by WHO and FAO. Certain rules and conditions have been laid to ensure that the quality of food produced meets the agencies' standards. This has been as a result of the long ranging debate and the several researches and surveys carried out to find out whether modern food alterations have led to loss in quality of life and health. This paper will be attempting confirm that many researches and the

communication from medical quarters have all pointed at the fact that there is a relationship between ‘ modern’ lifestyle diseases and the quality of food manufactured nowadays.

The general feeling is that there are several revisions made to the foods that are consumed today right from their growth through production and packing to storage and exhibition (Deiner, 2012). The uses, for various reasons, of fertilizers, insecticides, pesticides, growth accompaniments, drying and ripening agents as well as greenhouse effects have led to genetic re-composition of foods leading to modification and adaptation of the dietary quality of the end product (Shepard, 2004). These foods are then taken through different processes that involve chemical additives during production and are later further altered by the addition of additives meant for preservation. The length of time that these foods spend in the fridges before sale also leads to the cellular rottenness of the same and eventually yields slow food poisoning that only manifests after lengthy use of the same (Shepard, 2004). These concerns led to the dire need to have international conventions that govern the quality of food and the methods of handling these foods.

Food quality can be described as the characteristics characterized as quality acceptable for consumers. There are several factors that are considered in determining the suitability of food quality for eating. These include the general appearance i. e. size, shape, color), flavor, texture and internal factors like chemical ingredients and microbial factors. Countries have enforced food safety through different policies (Shepard, 2004). The US has for instance the Food Safety Act of 1990. Through trading standards

professions, the members of public can complain regarding the quality of food to public analysts and submit samples. These samples are used for tests that determine the quality of the food manufactured. It is a requirement since consumers are susceptible to any form of contamination during the process. Both manufacturing and processing standards are used by consumers to determine the ingredients present so as to measure the dietary, nutritional requirement or medical condition of the food (Deiner, 2012). Apart from ingredient quality there are also sanitation requirements. The food processing environment must ensure high standards of cleanliness so as to produce the safest possible food for consumers. The 2006 North American E-coli outbreak is a recent example of poor sanitation that involved spinach (Shepard, 2004). This outbreak is still under investigation after some new information has been exposed regarding the involvement of Cambodian nationals.

Food quality caters for products traceability like packaging and components. These issues however are less concerned with the wider picture of the pigmentation between health and food. They are however strong indicators of health and as required by the WHO provisions, packaging material should expose the ingredients of a particular product hence helping the consumer make a wise and informed choice on the products that they ingest (Deiner, 2012). The consumers' judgment is based on taste, convenience, health, packaging and labeling, environmental friendliness and innovation. Many consumers rely and trust the set normalization bodies for safe and healthy food (Shepard, 2004). Food safety on the other hand is more scientific and involves the processes involved in preparation and storage of food with an

aim of preventing food borne illnesses. The safety measures include routines followed as a preventive measure against health risks caused by food. This tries to get safety between the industry and the market then between the market and the consumer (Deiner, 2012). The factors considered include; labeling, hygiene, additives and pesticide residues. There is also the cognition and consideration of policies concerning biotechnology and set guidelines by government on inspection and certification.

Food can be medium for diffusion of disease between people through harboring bacteria that causes food poisoning. While in developed countries food preparation meets standards that ensure low disease transmission developing countries still lag behind in the same due to factors like lack of adequate safe water (Deiner, 2012). Theorists nonetheless front the argument that food poisoning and pollution is 100 per cent preventable. This can be done if the five main principles of food hygiene can be followed. These principles are;

- Prevention of infection with pathogens from external sources like handlers.
- Separation of foods that is raw and cooked.
- Preparation of foods for appropriate time to rid all pathogens.
- Storage of food at right temperatures and for the safest periods.

According to the WHO 2003 report on food safety, there are 76 million cases of food borne illnesses leading to 325, 000 hospital cases and 5, 000 deaths annually in the US alone (Deiner, 2012). This led to the publishing of the Codex Alimentarius, a guideline to food safety. The guidelines however have far reaching suggestions on trade disputes and therefore fail to be a safe solution due to issues with feasibility (Shepard, 2004).

The selfishness of the market controllers in food production and sale leads to predisposal of a world’s population to diseases reducing from poisoning. The governments that fight these policies are selfish in thought and action (Deiner, 2012). Diseases continue to affect consumers across world markets from the sale of low quality nonstandard foods as a few individuals make a kill from the sales. The effects are that the reason that the guidelines were not viable for trade was that the companies and governments that are in the industrial foods industry found that the guidelines could hinder their sales (Deiner, 2012). On the other hand should the governments allow the trade to go on and hinder international trade, it could lead to deafening of businesses due to parameters considered within the guidelines, This could see the prices of food products rising due to higher prices in production. Altogether, this could lead to more cases of disease caused by industrial foods as companies aim at local production that is cheaper but not necessarily safer (Lindeberg, 2010).

Further research suggests that the additives that manufacturers add to our foods could be without the knowledge of the regulatory bodies. In fact, they claim that there are over 1000 additives. These additives are intentionally put in the foods by manufacturers for purposes that point at more productivity in terms of sales and consequently profits (Lindeberg, 2010). For direct additives, added intentionally to food, only 21. 6 percent of the almost 4, 000 additives have undergone the feeding studies necessary for scientists to approximate a nontoxic standard of disclosure, and the FDA records incorporate generative or evolving poisonousness information for only 6. 7% (Lindeberg, 2010). It gives the impression that the FDA as well as the food

production was time and again making protection decisions by matching one chemical to a different one instead of doing a definite toxicology investigation. In coming up with such conclusions, they were formulating a detail grounded on conventions and unsupported reports as an alternative of undeviating methodical validation (Deiner, 2012).

How has the misunderstanding of our food principles gone so really inaccurate? The researchers have a few insights. First, many chemicals were initialized into the scheme in the 1950's, and therefore making it into our food sources deprived of facts on their well-being on the human health (Lindeberg, 2010). The moment a chemical is allowed for consumption in foodstuffs, the authorization is continual and so there are no necessities or enticements for a producer to demand for an additional verification for that will slow production as well as putting the whole production process in jeopardy (Schlosser, 2012). In the non-operational U. S Food Additives Amendment of 1958, the FDA has no right to ask for an analysis if it has reservations about a chemical being used in food to be consumed by human beings. It is a disgrace that FDA is not bothered with many of the compounds that are being added to foodstuffs in addition to the fact that the organization doesn't have obligatory statements on the foodstuffs when industrial chemicals have been used for the enhancement of food source (Shepard, 2004).

The lack of guidance and evident lack of oversight by the relevant authorities has led to more negligence by manufacturers. Manufacturers sit pretty with the knowledge that the agencies concerned have not found any illegal additives in their foods and the consumers too have failed to report cases.

The production therefore carries on (Lindeberg, 2010). However, consumers may lack knowledge and since they trust the agencies like FDA to ensure quality in standards of the foods they eat. This belief leads to the cases of diseases that later affect them. The agencies however also may be hoodwinked and should not carry the burden of blame entirely as at times, companies flaunt only samples of their products for inspection (Shepard, 2004). They later produce additive laced products later for the consumers without the knowledge of the authorities.

There is disagreement over GMOs, especially with respect to their usage in the manufacturing of human food with the contention involving users, biotechnology establishments, administrative watchdogs, non-administrative governments, and researchers (Shepard, 2004). Their main aspects of disagreement in relation to the GMO foodstuffs is whether or not the GM foodstuff ought to be categorized in addition to the starring role of the government watchdogs, the consequences of GM produces on healthiness of the human beings plus the environment in addition to the consequences on pesticide struggle, the influence of GM crops for farmers that are to use them and finally the starring role of GM crops in nourishing the world’s populace (Schlosser, 2012). Advocacy groups such as Organic Consumers Association among others ascertain that the threats of GM food have not been sufficiently acknowledged for them to be well managed. They have equally probed and grilled the independence of the governing establishments towards the protection of human beings from such toxics getting to their foodstuffs. Opponents claim that foodstuffs resulting as of GMOs may be hazardous and advocate for it be forbidden, or at least labeled

so that individuals can have a choice on the kind of foods that the want (Deiner, 2012). They have communicated their trepidations on the independence of watchdogs and their thoroughness when it comes to the supervisory process in addition to the special effects of GMOs on the surroundings and environment at large.

Specialists approximate that around 60% to 70% of processed foods stuffs in U. S. grocery counters have been genetically fully of partly with the most genetically adjusted foods being the soybeans, maize, cotton, and rapeseed oil among other crops. That implies that a majority of the foods produced in the United States are most likely to have genetically modified ingredients in them and it is worth noting that these elements appear frequently in animal feed as well (Shepard, 2004). Equally shocking is the new USDA-funded survey that as well illustrates the same results. Investigators from the Food Policy Institute at Rutgers' Cook College established that only 52% of American populace knew or had the knowledge that genetically modified foodstuffs are sold in grocery shelves with only 26% of them alleging that they have never eaten genetically modified foodstuffs (Deiner, 2012). As a counter argument, GMO technology is said to be beneficial in various ways. To begin with, questions have been raised concerning the safety of GMOs. Although some people have doubts on this issue, it has been shown, through various experiments, that GMOs are safe for consumption (Shepard, 2004). Before they are released into the market, the products have to go through various tests, and only those that qualify make the cut. The other advantage is pest and disease resistance. Through this technology, it is easier to produce organisms that are resistant to pests and diseases. This is turn

reduces farm production expenses through cutting down money spent on pesticides and other forms of chemicals (Nelson, 2001). Genetically contrived crops are harmless, counter crops virus effectively similar to providing the much-needed food for those that are starving in various countries unlike the EU position. For them, they have preferred organic food stuffs that are much healthier as per their conclusion. The menaces of genetically modified foods to the health of people and the environment overshadow the remunerations that they stand to gain as a nation (Schlosser, 2012). Only the international biotech corporations stand to gain and dominate as the world food source and holding of customary farmers and their way of producing food for human consumption.

Risks for the GMO include:

- Introducing allergens and toxins to food especially in the most developed countries that use the genetically modified foods. A gene is developed in a plant that forms a new allergen that results to an allergic reaction in human beings.

- Accidental infection between genetically modified and non-genetically modified foods

- Antibiotic resistance

- Adversely changing the nutrient content of a crop resulting to them becoming unfit to meet the nutritional content that the human bodies require of them.

- Creation of " super" weeds and other environmental risks

- Unknown effects on the human health as a result of the introduction of

extraneous genes into the foods that will eventually end up into the body of human beings.

- Affects the environment for instance the un-envisioned impairment that they do to organisms in the environment of which they cause harm to human beings in the long run due to their toxicities not to mention their contributory role in the gene transfer to non-target species of which the human beings become affected too in the long run.

Benefits of GMO include:

- Increased pest and disease resistance something that enables the losses that may be encountered as a result of their failed usage.
- Drought tolerance or salinity tolerance crops are beneficial for they play a big role in the elimination of hunger that may be as a result of more population as compared to the less food produced per year.
- Increased food supply will be continuous throughout the year for drought resistance foods will have been produced.
- Pest resistance products that will resist diseases and as a result, food production will be enhanced to the point of hunger reduction.

In conclusion, it can be deduced clearly from the above elucidation that industrial foods has come to be a solution for the food shortages that many countries are facing in recent times. Statistics have been given herein too supporting the facts but one thing that ought to be understood too is that the industrial foods have both the positives and negatives sides. As to whether they are the cause of the various diseases that the world is facing in

recent times, it is up to the reader for all the arguments and counterarguments have been elucidated herein.

References

Deiner, Penny Low (2012) Nutrition Now Cengage Learning

Evaluation Process Could Be Enhanced, DIANE Publishing

Genetically Modified Foods Experts View Regimen of Safety Tests As Adequate, but FDA's

Lindeberg, S. (2010). Food and western disease: Health and nutrition from an evolutionary perspective. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Marion Nestle Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health University

Of California Press, May 14, 2013

Ranken, M. D., Christopher, G. J. Baker, R. C. (1997) Food Industries Manual Springer

Schlosser, E. (2012). Fast food nation: The dark side of the all-American meal. Boston: Mariner Books/Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Shepard, Tristram (2004) Food Technology Nelson Thornes