

Genetically Modified Salmon Sold As Sushi In Canada, Coming to the U.S. Soon.

The Cornucopia Institute reports that GMO salmon is being sold as sushi and sashimi in Canada. AquaBounty Technologies is a Massachusetts-based biotechnology company that produces genetically modified fish called “AquAdvantage,” that they say is “The World’s Most Sustainable Salmon.”

AquaBounty is the first and only company selling genetically engineered salmon. Scientists inserted a growth-hormone gene from Chinook salmon and genetic regulatory elements from the ocean pout into Atlantic salmon.

Although AquaBounty, the makers of engineered fast-growing salmon, have refused to tell the public where their product is being sold, their CEO recently bragged to investors that it is being used in the Canadian buyer’s “high-end sashimi lines, not their frozen prepared foods.” Consumers must continue to be wary of the origin of their food: know your farmer!” – [The Cornucopia Institute](#)

Ron Stotish, AquaBounty’s CEO, told investors last Thursday that they have sold 4.5 tonnes of it in Canada so far this year, and that,

The people who bought our fish were very happy with it. They put it in their high-end sashimi lines, not their frozen prepared foods.”

Related: [How to Avoid GMOs in 2018 – And Everything Else You Should Know About Genetic Engineering](#)

In Canada, GM fish does not have to be labeled as such.

Consequently, customers may not know if the salmon they ordered is genetically modified.

AquaAdvantage Salmon is engineered to grow at twice the rate of regular salmon while consuming up to 2 percent less feed than regular farmed salmon.

This is an untenable situation. The fact that, once again, the company has let slip a piece of information to investors – but is information Canadian consumers need and don't have – exposes how much it is that Canadians need labelling.” – [Lucy Sharratt](#) of the Canadian Biotechnology Action Network

Recommended: [How to Heal Your Gut](#)

The FDA has approved AquaAdvantage salmon for human consumption, but wild salmon is big business for Alaska, so Senator Lisa Murkowski and other Alaskan officials in Congress got the FDA to block AquaAdvantage imports until new GMO labeling regulations are in effect for food labels. Senator Lisa Murkowski [introduced the amendment](#) prohibiting the import of the GM eggs needed to produce AquaBounty's salmon, and she co-sponsored legislation mandating the labeling of genetically engineered salmon.

**With 8,000 Lawsuits Pending,
Bayer Claims No Buyer's
Remorse Following Monsanto**

Verdict

Bayer is dealing with the fallout from the 289 million dollar verdict against its new acquisition, Monsanto. Now that a jury has found the world's most popular herbicide, glyphosate, guilty of causing a California man's non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, the German pharmaceutical company faces increased scrutiny from regulators, shareholders, and the public. The number of lawsuits in the U.S. increased dramatically by the end of July.

Bayer finalized their Monsanto deal on July 7th, and the company has spent much of that time putting out legal and financial fires. Since the verdict, Bayer share prices have dropped over 10 percent. Monsanto's reported yearly income in 2017 was over 2.2 billion dollars, but the impact of their recent court defeat on the company's overall income could be huge. It remains to be seen if Bayer will regret the 66 billion dollars they paid for Monsanto.

Related: [How to Avoid GMOs in 2018 – And Everything Else You Should Know About Genetic Engineering](#)

The Floodgates Open

Bayer has experienced a significant uptick in complaints brought against them in response to the recent jury decision. In the U.S., the number of lawsuits jumped from 5,200 to over 8,000. Some legal analyst were expecting the number of lawsuits to be higher, but it's clear that Bayer's transition will not be a smooth one from a legal standpoint. The news doesn't seem to bother Bayer CEO Werner Baumann, who outlined the companies' response to these complaints.

We will vigorously defend this case and all upcoming cases."

Nothing to See Here, Folks

Baumann's statement regarding lawsuits is nothing new. Consider the statement obtained from by a Bayer spokesperson after the court decision.

Bayer is confident, based on the strength of the science, the conclusions of regulators around the world and decades of experience, that glyphosate is safe for use and does not cause cancer when used according to the label."

Now check out this statement from Monsanto in an article about a 2009 study that found Round-up contained an ingredient responsible for cell death.

Roundup has one of the most extensive human health safety and environmental data packages of any pesticide that's out there...It's used in public parks, it's used to protect schools. There's been a great deal of study on Roundup, and we're very proud of its performance."

According to the people that manufacture and make money off of it, Roundup and glyphosate are safe because they've always been safe.

Recommended: [*Best Supplements To Kill Candida and Everything Else You Ever Wanted To Know About Fungal Infections*](#)

New Coach, Same Game Plan

The verdict for Dewayne Johnson has been a welcome victory for the people who have been yelling about the harmful effects of glyphosate for years. It also comes at a time when the company is more vulnerable than usual. But Bayer has made it clear they have no intention of disrupting the practices that continue to make money.

Are 8,000 lawsuits in the U.S. costly enough for them to reconsider the damage their products do?

Sources:

- [Bayer's Monsanto faces 8,000 lawsuits on glyphosate – Reuters](#)
 - [Monsanto Weed Killer Roundup Faces New Doubts on Safety in Unsealed Documents – New York Times](#)
 - [Weedkiller glyphosate 'doesn't cause cancer' – Bayer – BBC News](#)
 - [Bayer sees no reason to re-evaluate Monsanto legal risks – Reuters](#)
 - [Monsanto Lost! Ordered to Pay \\$289 million in California Roundup Cancer Trial – Organic Lifestyle Magazine](#)
 - [Weed-Whacking Herbicide Proves Deadly to Human Cells – Scientific American](#)
-

Trump's FDA Is Bringing Back Asbestos and Making Russian Company Very Happy

In his continued effort to make America great again, Donald Trump is bringing back asbestos.

Asbestos is a mineral fiber with a lot of qualities desirable for manufacturing. It's an excellent heat insulator, it dampens sound, and it is fire-resistant, strong, and inexpensive. It also causes cancer. Many studies have confirmed it.

It also causes cancer. Asbestos exposure is the only known cause of mesothelioma, a deadly form of lung cancer that is known to be extremely painful. Asbestos exposure is also linked to other lung diseases. Many studies have confirmed this. Thousands of lawsuits have been won against asbestos companies. In the last thirty years, seventy billion dollars has been spent on asbestos litigation, and more than seventy companies have been driven into bankruptcy because of said litigation. The Environmental Working Group estimates that 12,000 to 15,000 people die yearly in the U.S. from asbestos exposure, but other studies indicate that asbestos could be responsible for 40,000 deaths per year in the U.S. If you find asbestos in your home the EPA strongly recommends that you hire a professional to remove the asbestos. They come in with hazmat suits and respirators. More than 60 countries have banned the use of asbestos. In the U.S. Here, the EPA only banned some uses of the material but all uses.

Despite all of this, Trump likes asbestos.

There is no new research disputing the health effects of asbestos, but regardless, Trump's EPA wants to expand the legal uses for Asbestos. Can you guess why? One hint. Russia.

Uralasbest, a Russian mining firm, placed a seal with Trump's face on their asbestos products. On their Facebook page, they posted their appreciation:

Дональд на нашей стороне!Комбинат «Ураласбест» выпустил необычную партию хризотила: на упаковке паллетов с минералом..

Posted by [ОАО "Ураласбест"](#) on [Sunday, June 24, 2018](#)

The translation reads:

Donald is on our side!

The combine "Uralasbest" produced an unusual batch of

chrysotile: on the packaging of pallets with a mineral there is a stamp

“Approved by Donald Trump, 45th President of the United States”. In this unusual way, the workers of the combine’s asbestos-processing plant thanked US President Donald Trump for his words in defense of chrysotile-asbestos.

He supported the head of the US Environmental Protection Agency Scott Pruitt, who stated that his agency would no longer deal with the negative effects that could potentially result from products containing asbestos. Donald Trump supported the specialist and called asbestos “100 percent safe after use.”

“We came out with the initiative to support our chrysotile industry in this way and remind that our” mountain flax “is an important mineral for the whole world. The management has approved! “, They told in the factory.

The EPA declined to ban uses of asbestos that have already been abandoned by industry. They also put forth a “significant new use rule,” or SNUR, that requires manufacturers to notify and seek approval from the EPA before resuming asbestos production and uses.

According to environmental advocates, this new rule gives chemical companies the upper hand in creating new uses for such harmful products in the United States. In May, the EPA released a report detailing its new framework for evaluating the risk of its top prioritized substances. The report states that the agency will no longer consider the effect or presence of substances in the air, ground, or water in its risk assessments.” – [The Architects Newspaper](#)

The EPA is ignoring specific exposures to asbestos in the safety assessments, which is reportedly in violation of law,

and they are disregarding the safety risks from asbestos that still lingers in old schools, homes, and building materials just about everywhere in the U.S.

The EPA has also eliminated many kinds of asbestos from the FDA's definition of asbestos.

Recommended:

- [*Best Supplements To Kill Candida and Everything Else You Ever Wanted To Know About Fungal Infections*](#)
 - [*Holistic Guide to Healing the Endocrine System and Balancing Our Hormones*](#)
 - [*Best Supplements To Kill Lyme and Everything Else You Ever Wanted To Know About Lyme Disease*](#)
-

Trump Administration Ordered to Stop Drugging Migrant Children

The Shiloh Treatment Center, in Texas near Manvel, is one of 32 Texas facilities that is licensed to care for migrant children who have been separated from their parents. The officials there were administering psychotropic prescription drugs to migrant children without consent from the parents. This violates the state's child welfare laws. Late last month U.S. District Judge Dolly Gee in Los Angeles ordered that the Trump administration must stop giving these drugs to migrant children without parental or guardian consent, except in an emergency.

The federal judge also ordered that the government move the

children out of that facility except for children that were deemed to pose a “risk of harm.”

Government officials said they only provided the psychotropic on an emergency basis, but the judge didn’t believe it, and pointed to testimony from children who said they were drugged “every morning and every night.” Children testified that U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement staff members would sometimes refuse to tell the children what drugs they were taking or why. Some reported being forcibly injected. Children said they experienced side effects including nausea, dizziness, depression, and weight gain.

One child held at Shiloh identified as Isabella said,

“I witnessed staff members forcefully give medication four times.

. . . Two staff members pinned down the girl . . . and a doctor gave her one or two injections.”

Recommended: [*In Shocking Development, Chemicals in Food and Packaging are Toxic to Children*](#)

Read more: [*Trump administration must stop giving psychotropic drugs to migrant children without consent, judge rules*](#)

**In Shocking Development,
Chemicals in Food and**

Packaging are Toxic to Children

The American Academy of Pediatrics recently issued a statement calling for more stringent food safety standards. Children are especially vulnerable to the negative effects of food additives, processed foods, and toxic food packaging. These harmful substances can have long-lasting health consequences for little ones. The chemicals of particular interest to the AAP are nitrates, bisphenols, phthalates, and perfluorinated compounds. In spite of a growing number of scientific studies, the FDA still lists these products as “generally regarded as safe” (GRAS). The AAP wants to change, or at least reexamine, that.

Regulation and oversight of many food additives is inadequate because of several key problems in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Current requirements for a “generally recognized as safe” (GRAS) designation are insufficient to ensure the safety of food additives and do not contain sufficient protections against conflict of interest. Additionally, the FDA does not have adequate authority to acquire data on chemicals on the market or reassess their safety for human health. These are critical weaknesses in the current regulatory system for food additives. Data about health effects of food additives on infants and children are limited or missing; however, in general, infants and children are more vulnerable to chemical exposures.”

“Safe” Chemicals to Look Out For

The health problems with generally regarded as safe chemicals are fairly well known, although the way in which they affect children in the long-term is not definitively known. Nitrates/nitrite, phthalates, bisphenols (including bisphenol

A (BPA), bisphenol AF (BPAF), bisphenol Z (BPZ), bisphenol S (BPS), bisphenol F (BPF), bisphenol AP (BPAP), and bisphenol B (BPB), and perfluorinated compounds (PFCs) are ever present in today's food system, and they can be found both in and around the items we feed our children.

Related: [How to Detox From Plastics and Other Endocrine Disruptors](#)

- Nitrates, which turn into nitrites, are ions that naturally occur in a wide range of foods like celery, spinach, lettuce, onions, broccoli, and peas. They perform a useful function in the body, acting as a free radical, and an argument can successfully be made that nitrates are safe. However, they are able to function positively in vegetables because vitamin c and polyphenols in the plants keep carcinogenic n-nitroso compounds from forming. Nitrates used as preservatives processed animal-based products like hot dogs and lunch meats produce a very different effect on health, as they don't have the same polyphenols and antioxidants and allow n-nitroso to form. Those compounds have been linked to cancer, mania (mental health issues), and can render hemoglobin unable to carry oxygen. This is an example of a substance that is beneficial in one context and a serious health risk in another. A proper vetting process from a regulatory agency would be able to notice the difference.
- PFCs come into contact with food through grease, oil, and stain resistant coating on food wrappers. They are also used in Teflon and can be found in non-stick cookware. This is a large group of chemicals and some of the more recognizable compounds are perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS), perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), perchlorates, and perfluoroalkyl. Researchers have found connections between these chemicals and endocrine disruption, kidney and testicular cancer, liver toxicity, immune system damage, and most immediately

relevant to children, reduced birth weights. It takes three years for any amount of PFCs that enter the body to reduce to half. There are children who have had a non-necessary chemical linked to numerous health conditions in their systems since they were born.

- Bisphenols are commonly used in cans, bottles, and receipts. Trace amounts of these chemicals are also found in drinking water throughout the U.S. These chemicals are endocrine disruptors and have been linked to hormonal issues; breast, prostate, and testicular cancers; and inflammatory bowel disease. The most famous of the bisphenols is bisphenol-A (BPA), which incidentally the FDA banned the use of in baby bottles in 2012. They did allow the GRAS designation to continue for the rest of the bisphenols, but a recent study has found that those chemicals cause hormonal issues like BPA does. Some of them (BFAP, BPB, and BPZ) are even better at mimicking estrogen in the body, the primary reason for bisphenols' endocrine disruption. The New York State Assembly recently proposed a bill expanding the ban on BPA in children's bottles to a ban on all bisphenols. No word yet from the FDA, though.
- Phthalates are added to plastics to make them more flexible and are found in water pipes, electronics, medical devices, food packaging, and a myriad of other places. There are many of them and no way to avoid them. Even the most scrupulous avoidance practices (glass packaging, organic, filtered water...) will be unable to completely filter them out and their GRAS status (which does not require their presence to be announced) ensures they can be anywhere. Some of the more prominent phthalates are fat-soluble, making foods containing high levels of fat like dairy and meat a likely culprit of exposure. Phthalates have been linked to endocrine disruption and breast cancer, as well as other conditions like asthma, attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, diabetes, autism, and neurodevelopmental

disorders.

This is not new information. But we need to ask why this is the best our food system can do. The AAP is continuing that discussion, and the question remains. Why are these chemicals still “generally regarded as safe”?

Related: [*Sugar Leads to Depression – World’s First Trial Proves Gut and Brain are Linked \(Protocol Included\)*](#)

How We Got Here

The GRAS designation was introduced in 1958. The list was meant to be used only for staples like salt and pepper, but an amendment to the law in 1997 gave companies the power to make their own decisions on which ingredients are generally regarded as safe. The rule also made the reporting process for these decisions entirely voluntary. That rule has not been significantly modified since 1997. Changes were published in 2016, but those didn’t address what become a major health issue, companies allowed to market products they have decided are safe without any actual government oversight or independent scientific review. In the FDA’s own words in 2016,

We also are amending our regulations to replace the voluntary GRAS affirmation petition process with a voluntary notification procedure under which any person may notify us of a conclusion that a substance is GRAS under the conditions of its intended use.”

If we are to believe the FDA, we’ve moved to a system where the administration has even less oversight. No longer are companies required to ask for permission. Now they merely tell us it’s safe based on the numbers and studies they themselves have produced. This is a system ripe for corruption.

It’s also a system that hasn’t significantly changed or made accommodations for how quickly food technology is changing.

All of the above substances, nitrates, phthalates, PFCs, and bisphenol are still regarded as safe, in spite of multiple studies claiming otherwise. The FDA has a major conflict between what independent science has discovered, and the AAP is not the only organization to highlight that fact. Several prominent consumer and environmental groups, including Center for Food Safety, Breast Cancer Prevention Partners, Center for Science in the Public Interest, Environmental Defense Fund, and the Environmental Working Group, sued the administration in 2017 for failing to do its job.

Now we have a major medical group that serves one of the most vulnerable groups in the U.S., children, calling for change. Which is great, but the FDA has received this kind of admonishment before.

Related: [Autism Correlates with Circumcision](#)

This Parent's Rant

How does it make you feel as a parent?

I feel demoralized. The amount of judgment involved in raising a child is overwhelming.

I'm angry. Sometimes it feels like even those who are trying to help aren't actually doing anything. The FDA isn't. According to Dr. Leonardo Trasande, the lead author of the statement and chief of the division of environmental pediatrics at New York University's School of Medicine,

The good news is there are safe and simple steps people can take right now to limit exposures, and they don't have to break the bank..."

Why is that my job now? Of course, I want to ensure that my little ones are as healthy and free from dangerous chemicals as possible. But why is the health of my kids and your kids

and the kids you never see in your neighborhood because they can't go anywhere without supervision less important than a company being able to label their products with toxic plastic hardeners the way they always have? Why am I the one to bear those costs? I know it's naive to assume it's that simple, but it doesn't make me any less angry.

As a mother, I can't help seeing how quickly we are condemned for stepping even a little out of line. Telling your child they can't have ice cream in the grocery store results in people who have no knowledge of your food needs telling you to let the kid have a treat. Allowing children to run and play in public spaces, even parks, produces contempt from complete strangers. Let's not even touch on how quickly parents who dare to question vaccinations are shamed.

Why doesn't that exist for the companies that systematically undermine our health and food systems when they know how much damage they're causing? It's money, and there's no way I can compete. I'm demoralized, and sometimes it's too much.

Our priorities as a country are incredibly disappointing and more damaging than we can fully appreciate. Lately, I find myself wondering what would happen if the companies that knowingly deny how toxic their chemicals are and prevent further study to maximize profits were punished as swiftly as a woman leaving her 8-year-old child in the car to get coffee.

Related: [**New Study Shows Glyphosate Does Cause Tumors and Birth Defects, and More**](#)

Does It Have to Be This Way?

The AAP is correct to call out the FDA for the GRAS designations. The FDA is meant to regulate food safety. Yet companies have the ability to put products are on the shelf with ingredients that have received no impartial or independent scrutiny. At some point, every consumer has to put

their trust in someone to produce food for them. The FDA has lost that trust.

These chemicals fundamentally alter the quality of life that is available to our children. The body is always detoxing, but how can that be effective when these chemicals are constantly being replenished? The health challenges to overcome for our next generation continue to accumulate. This needs to be addressed sooner, rather than later.

Sources:

- [Chemicals in Food May Harm Children, Pediatricians' Group Says – NY Times](#)
- [Food Additives and Child Health – AAP News and Journals](#)
- [Children are being harmed by food additives, U.S. pediatric association warns – The Globe and Mail](#)
- [GRAS: The Hidden Substances in Your Food – Consumer Reports](#)
- [Center for Science and Others Sue FDA Over GRAS Rule \(Generally Recognized as Safe\) – National Law Review](#)
- [Nitrates from Cured Meat Have Been Linked to Mania in New Study – Organic Lifestyle Magazine](#)
- [Phthalates Are Everywhere, and the Health Risks Are Worrying. How Bad Are They Really? – The Guardian](#)
- [Perflourinated Chemicals: Teflon and Stain Protectors – Toxic-Free Futures](#)

Surprising Truths About Legalizing Cannabis (video)

In 2012, Colorado legalized cannabis and kickstarted a multibillion-dollar industry with every product imaginable –

brownies, gummy bears, granola bars, even lube! But to say that we've "legalized cannabis" is mistaken – we've commercialized THC. In this fascinating talk, expert Ben Cort examines the impacts of this growing new industry on everything from policing & arrest rates to LGBTQ issues. Sober since 1996, Ben Cort has seen the devastation that substance abuse can bring first hand as well as the joy that is recovery. He spent the last 10 years inside nonprofit drug treatment and education programs like Phoenix Multisport, Stout Street Foundation, and The University of Colorado Hospital. He is the author of [Weed, INC.](#), a professional speaker, and a frequent guest in the media. Ben is a husband, father of three, and an avid sportsman. He enjoys fly fishing, hunting, mountaineering, and bike racing.

Takeaways:

- CBD is where most of the medical benefits are, but we prefer the psychoactive THC
- The cannabis we use is not "natural," it's far too high in THC
- Beware of the chemical being used to grow the plants
- Rich white people are controlling the market
- Denver's pot business caters mostly to low-income, minority neighborhoods
- Marijuana-related youth arrest rates have increased among minorities
 - African Americans +58%
 - Hispanics +29%
 - Caucasian -8%

Our Best Articles:

- [*Detox Cheap and Easy Without Fasting – Recipes Included*](#)
- [*How to Make the Healthiest Smoothies – 4 Recipes*](#)
- [*How to Avoid GMOs in 2018 – And Everything Else You Should Know About Genetic Engineering*](#)

- [Best Supplements To Kill Candida and Everything Else You Ever Wanted To Know About Fungal Infections](#)
-

FDA Commissioner to Issue New Non-Dairy Milk Guidelines

For those of us who have been confused as to whether or not almond milk contains actual milk, the Food and Drug Administration under Trump's leadership is here to help. According to the FDA commissioner, Scott Gottlieb, the agency is planning on announcing a new guidance on the proper use of the term milk. In his own words,

If you look at our standard of identity—there is a reference somewhere in the standard of identity to a lactating animal...And, you know, an almond doesn't lactate, I will confess."

If only all confessions were obtained so easily!

Standard of Identity

So what is standard of identity? These are regulations set by the FDA that dictate what a food is, may be called, and the ingredients that must be used, may be used, or must be listed on the label. Standards of identity don't actually have anything to do with the quality of a product, though they do help protect against fraudulent versions of a product.

A great example of the standard of identity laws at work is Kraft Singles. These marvels of engineering are legally not allowed to be called cheese, as they are not made with at

least 51 percent real cheese. Until 2002, Kraft Foods labeled them as Kraft Singles Pasteurized Prepared Cheese Food until that name also ran afoul of the FDA standard of identity for cheese food due to the inclusion of milk protein isolates. They are now sold under the name Pasteurized Prepared Cheese Product.

Related: [Homemade Vegan Nut Milk Recipes](#)

Vegan Disruptions

There is a benefit to being able to set standards for what a product is. No one wants to bring home a package labeled cheese and open it to find Kraft Singles (cheap shot...sorry). But the way we eat has evolved rapidly, and what seemed ridiculous twenty years ago is now a worldwide phenomenon followed by more than a million people in the United States. When the FDA set into place the standards of identity, they did not foresee veganism.

The most notable disruption of these standards as of writing this occurred in 2014. Scrappy startup Hampton Creek, makers of popular vegan mayo Just Mayo, was reprimanded by the FDA for violating the mayonnaise standard of identity. Those circumstances are markedly different than these, as the FDA has not singled out a single specific company (likely because large businesses like Unilever haven't complained this time).

There is still an important parallel between the two cases. Both of these products, vegan mayonnaise and non-dairy milk, threaten animal product industries struggling to cope with modern societies desire for plant-based foods and the fallout from their own unsustainable practices. In 2014, Just Mayo inadvertently capitalized on an egg industry reeling from an avian flu season that claimed nearly 40 million chickens. Meanwhile, a dairy industry in decline has been complaining about the use of the word milk since 2017, going so far as to recruit thirty-two members of Congress to advocate for them.

In both of these cases, it appears that business is asking the government to step in and deal with this disruption for them.

Well Established Relationships

Based on the folksy, vaguely patronizing soundbite from the commissioner, it seems likely the FDA will come down on the side of the dairy industry. This is to be expected, though. The Trump Administration has proven itself to be extremely friendly to big business.

Gottlieb has been publically approving of big business friendly moves in the past. When the USDA moved its branch of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, a collaboration of more than 180 countries responsible for international food safety standards, he was among those to publically congratulate USDA head Sonny Perdue. While it might sound like a great idea to have the U.S. Codex Office housed at the USDA, that move leaves the national positions on food safety open to manipulation by big food producers. Internationally, this causes the rest of the world to become increasingly mistrustful of our science and safety regulations as well as our ractopamine-laced pigs and chlorine-washed chickens.

Related: [Best Cooking Oils – Health benefits, Smoke Point, Which to Use and Avoid](#)

International Agreement

But international food governing bodies are in agreement with the dairy farmers here. In fact, the EU ruled that items labeled milk, butter, cheese, cream, and yogurt must contain animal milk. A label clarifying the products plant-based origins will no longer suffice. Except for coconut milk...and almond milk...and cream filled sweets. There is also room for exceptions to the rules.

It feels almost like a punishment for soy and vegetable

products clearly labeled tofu butter and veggie cheese. Will the person purchasing these products be disappointed there is no milk or butter? They clearly don't mind the tofu or veggie part.

Related: [*Hellmann's Vs. Just Mayo – The Very Interesting Battle Within the Mayo Industry*](#)

At the same time, not everyone is informed when it comes to non-dairy alternatives. Soy milk and vegetable cheese are also fundamentally different from dairy milk and cheese, and that separation could have unintended benefits for vegan and non-dairy products. The EU no longer accepts certain animal products from the U.S. due to our lax animal welfare standards. Perhaps the FDA, in their desire to appease the dairy board and catch up with other worldwide legislation, are doing vegan companies an early favor.

Who Is Confused Here?

Vegan alternatives are everywhere. Removing the word milk from non-dairy alternatives won't change the growing demand for them.

Here's the biggest question. How are these products supposed to be labeled, and should their non-vegan counterparts be anywhere near that decision?

The real problem here is not the label.

Sources:

- [*"An almond doesn't lactate:" FDA to crack down on use of the word "milk" – Ars Technica*](#)
- [*Standards of identity for food –Science Direct*](#)
- [*Kraft American Cheese Singles Have Been Labeled A Health Food By Professional Nutritionists \(Not As A Joke\) – Huffington Post*](#)
- [*Hellmann's Vs. Just Mayo – The Very Interesting Battle*](#)

Within the Mayo Industry – Organic Lifestyle Magazine

- *A Food Fight Has Broken Out Between The USDA And FDA – Five Thirty Eight*
- *EU court bans dairy-style names for soya and tofu – BBC*