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NOTE

THE HUMBLE ALMOND: WHY CONGRESS SHOULD INSTITUTE THE PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE TO GUIDE REGULATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL TOXINS AND FOOD ADDITIVES

David Alan Nauheim†

I. INTRODUCTION

Imagine a world where a food consumed since biblical times¹ is deemed unsafe in its natural form, but fumigating that food with a "probable carcinogen,"² banned in most of Europe, Africa, Asia, and Canada,³ renders it "pasteurized."⁴ Or, imagine a world where a food that has been "blanched" in 190°F water for two minutes can be labeled "raw."⁵ This is the logic behind recent changes to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's ("USDA") regulation, Almonds Grown in California, 7 C.F.R. § 981 ("Rule").⁶ This is the story of how the combined⁷ forces of the Environmental Protection
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¹. "Put some of the best products of the land in your bags and take them down to the man as a gift—a little balm and a little honey, some spices and myrrh, some pistachio nuts and almonds." Genesis 43:11.


⁵. Id.

⁶. Specifically, the change to the rule is embodied in 7 C.F.R. § 981.442(b)(1) (September 1, 2007).

⁷. Various aspects of the Rule are administered by EPA, USDA, and FDA. Their jurisdictions are often concurrent and overlapping. For example, the EPA sets tolerances for pesticides, but the USDA approves their use on almonds. See, e.g., Legal and Policy Interpretation of the Jurisdiction Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of the Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency Over the Use of
Agency ("EPA"), Food and Drug Administration ("FDA"), and the USDA have deprived the people of a traditional and beneficial food, in its natural, unadulterated form, as it has been consumed for thousands of years.\(^8\)

Recent changes to the Rule abound with logical absurdities. Does the innocuous label "pasteurized" convey to consumers that the healthy food they think they are consuming contains a probable carcinogen?\(^9\) If the stated purpose of the new Rule is to "reduce the potential for salmonella bacteria in almonds,"\(^10\) why does the Rule subject all almonds to pasteurization, when the risk of salmonella is already eliminated in ninety-five percent of almonds through blanching, roasting, or baking?\(^11\) Does it make sense to impose a regulation on small and organic growers that is proportionally more costly for them, when they are already required to use costly salmonella avoiding techniques, which the commercial growers are not required to use?\(^12\)

This Note will argue that the new pasteurization requirements set out in recent changes to the Rule are not rationally related to the stated purpose of the Rule, are at once over inclusive and under inclusive, pose an undue and

---

*Certain Antimicrobial Substances, 63 FED. REG. 54,532 (Oct 9, 1998) (resolving which agency will exercise jurisdiction over PPO where jurisdiction overlaps).*

*8. There is a long list of traditional foods that have been consumed for thousands of years, but now must be pasteurized. Examples include milk, beer, raw cheese, eggs, spices, red meat, and vegetables. See Marsha A. Echols, Food Safety Regulation in the European Union and the United States: Different Cultures, Different Laws, 4 COLUM. J. EUR. L. 525, 531 (1998).*

*9. A food that contains propylene oxide does not need to indicate this on the label, but instead may bear the innocuous title, "pasteurized." The USDA does not consider this contrary to the Congressional Declaration of Policy for the Fair Packaging and Labeling Program which states, "Informed consumers are essential to the fair and efficient functioning of a free market economy. Packages and their labels should enable consumers to obtain accurate information as to the quantity of the contents and should facilitate value comparisons. Therefore, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to assist consumers and manufacturers in reaching these goals in the marketing of consumer goods." 15 U.S.C. § 1451 (Nov. 3, 1966).*

*10. Almonds Grown in California; Outgoing Quality Control Requirements, 72 FED. REG. 15,021 (March 30, 2007).*

*11. A May 21, 2004 press release of the California Almond Board states that "95 percent of almonds sold undergo processing, such as blanching, roasting or baking which eliminates any potential bacteria such as Salmonella Enteritidis." California Almond Board, California Almond Board Responds to FDA's Consumer Advisory Regarding Raw, Natural Almonds, http://www.almondsarein.com/AlmondLovers/nrdetail.cfm?ItemNumber=579 (May 18, 2004).*

unjustifiable burden on small and organic almond growers, and unjustifiably deny consumers the right to purchase the foods that they believe are healthy, safe, and nutritious. This Note will further argue that the current administrative rule-making regime lacks a guiding principle to incline agencies toward reasoned rule-making that adequately protects human health and autonomy. This Note will propose that Congress institute the "precautionary principle" as a guiding principle for regulatory rule-making that affects human health and autonomy. Section II of this Note will lay out the background in which the rule change was made. Section III will lay out the Rule and the statutes and case law that interact with the Rule. Section IV will critique the Rule. Section V will propose that Congress require food regulators to follow the precautionary principle.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE RULE

A. Who Really Cares About Almonds?

1. History of the Almond

Almonds have been consumed for thousands of years and are one of the world's oldest cultivated foods. They are mentioned in Genesis. King Tutankhamen took several handfuls with him to his grave in 1352 B.C. to snack on during his journey to the afterlife. Explorers carried almonds for food along the Silk Road, which may explain the almond's spread across the Mediterranean, Turkey, Iraq, Syria, and Iran. The Romans introduced almonds across the Roman Empire from Egypt to England.

Almonds were first grown in California by the Franciscan Padres in the mid 1700s. Later, the climate of California's Central Valley proved superior for growing almonds. Today, California is the only state in the U.S. where almonds are grown commercially. Almonds have become a $2

13. See infra note 291 and accompanying text.
15. See supra note 1.
18. Id.
19. Id.
20. Id.
21. Id.
billion industry and California boasts more than 6000 growers.\textsuperscript{22} Central California alone produces seventy-five percent of the world’s almond supply,\textsuperscript{23} which is exported to more than eighty countries.\textsuperscript{24}

2. Almonds: A Superfood

Almonds are one of the world’s healthiest foods.\textsuperscript{25} They are packed with protein.\textsuperscript{26} Almonds are a good source of manganese, copper, and vitamin B2, all of which play an important role in the body’s energy production.\textsuperscript{27} They are rich in magnesium, phosphorus, zinc, and vitamin E\textsuperscript{28} and high in favorable fatty acid and nutrients.\textsuperscript{29} Studies show that almonds lower bad cholesterol, significantly reducing the risk of heart disease.\textsuperscript{30} In fact, they are almost as effective at lowering cholesterol as statin drugs.\textsuperscript{31} Contrary to popular belief, while they are high in healthy fats, they do not cause weight gain.\textsuperscript{32} In fact, almonds, combined with a low calorie diet, can result in weight loss.\textsuperscript{33}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Id. A quarter cup of almonds has more protein than a typical egg. \textit{Id.}
\item \textsuperscript{27} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Penny M Kris-Etherton et al., \textit{Nuts and their Bioactive Constituents: Effects on Serum Lipids and Other Factors that Affect Disease Risk}, 70 AM. J. CLIN. NUTR. 504S, 505S (1999).
\item \textsuperscript{29} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{30} See, e.g., Mavis Abbey et al., \textit{Partial Replacement of Saturated Fatty Acids with Almonds or Walnuts Lowers Total Plasma Cholesterol and Low-Density-Lipoprotein Cholesterol}, 59 AM. J. CLIN. NUTR. 995 (May 1994); David J.A. Jenkins, M.D. et al., \textit{Dose Response of Almonds on Coronary Heart Disease Risk Factors: Blood Lipids, Oxidized Low-Density Lipoproteins, Lipoprotein(a), Homocysteine, and Pulmonary Nitric Oxide, A Randomized, Controlled, Crossover Trial}, 106 CIRCULATION, J. AM. HEART ASSOC. 1327 (2002).
\item \textsuperscript{31} David J.A. Jenkins et al., \textit{Direct Comparison of a Dietary Portfolio of Cholesterol-Lowering Foods with a Statin in Hypercholesterolemic Participants}, 81 AM. J. CLIN. NUTR. 380 (2005).
\item \textsuperscript{32} Joan Sabaté, \textit{Nut Consumption and Body Weight}, 78 AM. J. CLIN. NUTR. 647S (2003).
\item \textsuperscript{33} Lower calorie diets that use almonds, rather than carbohydrates, resulted in 11% weight loss. M.A. Wien et al., \textit{Almonds vs. Complex Carbohydrates in a Weight Reduction Program}, 27 INTL. J. OBESITY 1365 (2003).
\end{itemize}
Almond consumption at mealtime lowers the risk of diabetes and heart disease by decreasing after-meal blood sugar spikes.\textsuperscript{34} Consuming almonds at mealtime also reduces oxidative damage by providing antioxidants.\textsuperscript{35} One study reported that the skin of the almond alone may contain as many as thirty different flavanoids.\textsuperscript{36} Almonds have been shown to reduce colon cancer in mice\textsuperscript{37} and improve memory and learning in Alzheimer’s transgenic mice.\textsuperscript{38}

3. Raw Almonds: Superior to Cooked Almonds

Under the Rule, domestically grown raw almonds will no longer be commercially available.\textsuperscript{39} To appreciate the impact of this fact, one must understand the importance of raw almonds to groups like Raw Foodists,\textsuperscript{40} vegetarians,\textsuperscript{41} and Seventh Day Adventists.\textsuperscript{42}

Proponents of the “Raw Food Movement,” known as “Raw Foodists,” believe that raw and unprocessed foods are healthier than cooked and

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{34} David J.A. Jenkins et al., \textit{Almonds Decrease Postprandial Glycemia, Insulinemia, and Oxidative Damage in Healthy Individuals}, 136 J. NUTR. 2981 (2006).
  \item \textsuperscript{35} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{36} Chung-Yen Chen, et al., \textit{Flavonoids from Almond Skins Are Bioavailable and Act Synergistically with Vitamins C and E to Enhance Hamster and Human LDL Resistance to Oxidation}, 135 J. NUTR. 1366, 1370 (2005).
  \item \textsuperscript{37} Paul A. Davis et al., \textit{Whole Almonds and Almond Fractions Reduce Aberrant Crypt Foci in a Rat Model of Colon Carcinogenesis}, 165 CANCER LETTER 27 (2001).
  \item \textsuperscript{39} Domestically grown raw almonds will not be available in the U.S. because the Rule requires that all domestic almond handlers “subject their almonds to a treatment process . . . prior to shipment to reduce potential salmonella bacteria contamination.” 7 C.F.R. § 981.442(b)(1). While almonds may be labeled as raw, they will be blanched to meet the pasteurization requirements of this rule. \textit{Id.; see also} Cornucopia Institute, \textit{infra} note 251.
  \item \textsuperscript{40} Karyn Calabrese, Chicago raw food restaurateur says that “[t]he almond is the king of the nut world and a main staple for raw Foodists[.]” \textit{Some Find Pasteurized Almonds Rule Unsavory, A Plan to Battle Bacteria Angers Organic Farmers and Raw Food Fans,} L.A. TIMES (July 2, 2007).
  \item \textsuperscript{41} “[S]ome strict vegetarians who consume only raw foods rely on almonds to provide as much as 30% of their caloric intake, believing that they are a nutritionally superior alternative to meat in the diet.” Press Release, Cornucopia Institute, USDA Plan to “Pasteurize” Almonds Has Consumers Going Nuts: Mandate Would Require Use of Chemical Fumigant or Heat Treatment on “Raw” Almonds, http://www.cornucopia.org/almond/Almond_News_Release.pdf (August 7, 2007).
  \item \textsuperscript{42} For more than 130 years, Seventh Day Adventists have practiced a vegetarian diet, which includes nuts. Seventh-Day Adventists Dietetic Association, \textit{A Position Statement on the Vegetarian Diet}, http://www.sdada.org/position.htm (last accessed Jan 20, 2008).
\end{itemize}
processed food. The human body is designed to consume raw food, they argue, and many modern health problems are caused by overconsumption of cooked food. They point out that digestive, metabolic, and food enzymes, which are found in raw foods, are needed to trigger, facilitate, and accelerate proper digestion and assimilation of protein and fat, so that food can be broken down and absorbed in the small intestine. Food enzymes are found only in raw food. This is because prolonged heat kills enzymes, as does cooking and pasteurization. Raw food proponents point out that the standard American diet, low in raw and uncooked food, results in widespread nutrient and enzyme deficiency, leading to numerous health problems.

The Raw Foodists’ enzyme theory finds support in the work of Dr. Weston A. Price, DDS, an early proponent of raw foods. Dr. Price travelled the world documenting how indigenous people’s teeth degraded when they abandoned their traditional diets of unprocessed, unpasteurized foods. Dr. Price’s research, which included stunning photographic evidence, showed that the traditional peoples whose diets included unpasteurized and unprocessed raw food had excellent jaw development and dental health, but the first generation of children to adopt the modern diet suffered malocclusion and tooth decay. Dr. Price attributed this degradation to the modern diet, which was low in nutrients and devoid of raw food.

The research of Dr. Edward Howell, another early raw food proponent, showed how raw food starts the digestion process and reduces the body’s need to produce enzymes. Dr. Howell found that diets comprised primarily of cooked foods resulted in shorter life span, increased illness, lowered resistance to stress of all types, enlarged pancreas, and actual shrinkage of other organs, including the brain. Dr. Howell’s research also

43. “Science proves that cooking not only destroys nutrition and enzymes, but chemically changes foods from the substances we need for health into free-radicals and poisons that destroy our health!” Welcome to Raw Food for Life, http://www.rawfoodlife.com/ (last accessed Jan. 20, 2008).
44. Id.
46. Id. at 144.
47. Id.
48. Id.
50. Id.
52. Id.
showed that wet-heat temperatures at 118°F and above deactivate food enzymes. Amazingly, the body seems to be aware of this fact as foods and liquids at 170°F degrees can be touched without pain, but liquids over 118°F degrees will burn. Recent research shows that cooking certain meats at high temperatures creates chemicals not present in raw meat that may increase cancer risk.

Simply put, heat degrades food. As Raw Foodists put it, raw foods are living foods and cooked foods are dead foods. What they mean is that heat destroys food enzymes, which are necessary for digestion and absorption of nutrients. Not surprisingly, they believe that pasteurization will degrade almonds.

In fact, raw almonds may be healthier than cooked almonds. Almonds, rich in omega-3 fatty acids, are affected by heat in a way that other foods are not. Heat oxidizes the omega-3s in the almond, rendering them rancid. This diminishes the benefits of the omega-3s, further decreasing the nutritional value of the almond and producing free radicals. The USDA's own data shows that raw almonds, as compared to blanched almonds, have twenty-two percent more calcium, sixty-six percent more folate, and seventeen percent more fiber. Not surprisingly, Raw Foodists are among the strongest critics of mandatory pasteurization.

53. Id. Dry heat deactivates enzymes at 150°F or above. Id.
54. Id.
55. “[H]eterocyclic amines ("HCAs") are the carcinogenic chemicals formed from the cooking of muscle meats such as beef, pork, fowl, and fish. . . . One study conducted by researchers showed a threefold increase in the content of HCAs when the cooking temperature was increased from 200° to 250°C (392° to 482°F).” National Cancer Institute, Heterocyclic Amines in Cooked Meats, http://www.cancer.gov/cancertopics/factsheet/Risk/heterocyclic-amines (collecting authorities) (last accessed Jan. 20, 2008).
58. Id.
B. Events Which Led to the Promulgation of the Rule

In 2001, a salmonella outbreak, which was linked to non-organic raw California almonds, sickened over 100 people.\(^6\) In 2004, one person was killed and twenty-nine were sickened in a second outbreak linked to non-organic raw almonds from Paramount Farms in California, the world's largest supplier of almonds.\(^6\) In response, the California Almond Board ("ABC")\(^6\) unanimously recommended mandatory pasteurization for all almonds.\(^6\) The ABC cited concerns about consumer safety.\(^6\) "[A] prerequisite was that there would be no degradation of the product," said an ABC spokesperson, adding that nutritional specialists have tested almonds pre- and post-pasteurization and have found no differences in "sensory attributes."\(^6\)

Small and organic growers point out that salmonella has never been linked to raw almonds from small or organic growers.\(^6\) These farmers argue that the sustainable farming methods they use, including mulching rather than controlling weeds with chemicals, naturally prevent bacteria.\(^6\) Salmonella has also never been linked to cooked almonds, which account for ninety-five percent of almonds.\(^6\) This is because blanching, roasting, or baking eliminates potential bacteria.\(^6\) Nonetheless, the ABC pushed for a rule that did not distinguish between small organic growers, cooked almonds, or industrial growers. The ABC's attitude is "the press does not

---

62. While CAB would seem the proper acronym, the California Almond Board goes by the more poetic "ABC."
65. *Id.* (emphasis added).
69. *Id.*
distinguish between organic and nonorganic—they just made someone sick.\textsuperscript{70}

The ABC is a quasi-governmental entity established in 1950 to promote the “best quality of almonds” and administer the Federal Marketing Order on almonds.\textsuperscript{71} Growers must pay three cents on every pound of almonds they sell to fund the ABC.\textsuperscript{72} ABC makes recommendations to the USDA regarding almond regulation and selects the scientists who approve almond pasteurization requirements.\textsuperscript{73}

Critics say that the ABC is composed exclusively of large commercial producers and handlers and there is no representation for small and organic farmers.\textsuperscript{74} In fact, the 2006 board of directors hailed from California’s largest growers and producers, including: Travaille and Phippen, Inc., provider of hulling and shelling services for 5000 acres of almonds;\textsuperscript{75} Blue Diamond, the world’s largest almond coop;\textsuperscript{76} Hilltop Ranch, Inc., “one of the California Almond Industry’s fastest growing processors;”;\textsuperscript{77} Panoche Creek Packing, “one of the largest almond handlers in the industry,”\textsuperscript{78} Cummings-Violich, an agribusiness management firm with 7000 acres in cultivation;\textsuperscript{79} and Golden Hills Nut Company, annual processor of thirty million pounds of almonds.\textsuperscript{80}

\begin{flushright}
70. Id. Statement of Dave Phippen, who served as ABC president at the time ABC voted to recommend the rule.
73. Id.
74. There are no ABC board members who characterize themselves as “small growers.” There are, however, self-described large commercial growers on the board that market “organic almonds.” See infra notes 75-80 and accompanying text.
\end{flushright}
C. Pasteurization: What is Propylene Oxide?

Fumigation with propylene oxide ("PPO") is the least expensive and most common means of pasteurization.81 PPO is a volatile, clear, colorless, extremely flammable liquid with an ether-like odor.82 It is irritating to the respiratory system, harmful to skin, irritating to eyes, harmful if swallowed, and may cause heritable genetic damage.83 Prolonged exposure poses a possibility of individual organ or organ system damage and affects the central nervous system.84 PPO’s Material Safety Data Sheet ("MSDS")85 provides a long list of unpleasant symptoms that can arise from inhalation, contact with skin, or ingestion.86 The MSDS also provides for protective and cleanup measures for accidental release, handling, and storage. For example, where there is potential for dermal contact, full body personal protective equipment must be worn including solvent-proof gloves, clothing, hats, aprons, boots and vapor-proof goggles.87 Where PPO air concentrations are twenty ppm or greater, a full face self-contained breathing apparatus is required.88 These areas must be placarded to indicate the presence of PPO.89

PPO is used in the production of polyurethane foam, polyester resins, hydraulic fluid, drugs, antifreeze, and in fumigation chambers for the sterilization of foods.90 It is also used in thermobaric weapons.91 PPO was once used as an additive in stock car racing fuel, but is now banned due to health concerns.92

83. Id.
84. Id. at 7.
85. An MSDS is documentation supplied by manufacturers of dangerous chemicals to the user, which provides important information for the chemicals safe and legal use. 29 C.F.R. § 1910.1200(g)(1) (Jan. 10, 2008).
86. See Material Safety Data Sheet: Propylene Oxide, supra note 82 at 2-4.
87. Id.
88. Id.
89. Id.
90. Id.
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PPO is "known to cause cancer" in the state of California. It is not permitted for food use in most of Europe, Africa, Asia, and Canada. The Department of Health and Human Services says that PPO is reasonably anticipated to be a human carcinogen.

Further, PPO is known to cause cancer in animals. Administering PPO to animals by inhalation induced hemangiomas or hemangiosarcomas of the nasal cavity of mice, increased the incidences of papillary adenomas in rats, and increased the incidences of adrenal pheochromocytomas and peritoneal mesotheliomas. When administered by gavage to female rats, PPO produced an increase in the incidence of local tumors, primarily squamous cell carcinomas of the forestomach. When administered by subcutaneous injection to female mice, PPO increased the incidence of local tumors, mainly fibrosarcomas.

The Department of Transportation considers PPO a hazardous material and sets special requirements for marking, labeling, and transporting this material. The Clean Air Act lists PPO as a Hazardous Air Pollutant. The Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act requires reporting of spills in excess of 100 pounds, and Threshold Planning of quantities over 10,000 pounds. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration sets the Permissible Exposure Limit at 100 ppm. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health sets the Immediately Dangerous to Life and Health Level for PPO at 400 ppm.

93. See supra note 81, at 9. Ironically, while PPO is "known" to be a carcinogen in California that is the state where almonds are to be fumigated with PPO.
96. Id.
97. Id.
98. Id.
99. Id.
100. Id.
101. Id.
102. Id.
104. This is the level at which an atmospheric concentration of a toxic, corrosive, or asphyxiating substance that poses an immediate threat to life or would cause irreversible or
the EPA allows PPO to be used to "pasteurize" almonds to a surface residue of 300 ppm.\textsuperscript{105}

III. THE RULE

A. "Handlers shall subject their almonds to a treatment process"

The Rule requires that handlers "subject their almonds to a treatment process . . . prior to shipment to reduce potential salmonella bacteria contamination."\textsuperscript{106} There are exceptions for growers who sell their own almonds at their own roadside stand\textsuperscript{107} and so that growers can ship untreated almonds to verified processing facilities for treatment.\textsuperscript{108}

Almonds must be treated by a process identified as effective by an FDA "letter of determination" or by acceptance of the Technical Expert Review Panel ("TERP").\textsuperscript{109} The members of the TERP are chosen by the ABC board of directors.\textsuperscript{110} Thus far, the FDA has issued letters of determination for PPO fumigation, oil roasting, blanching, and for a moist heat process.\textsuperscript{111} TERP has recommended steam and moist heat for acceptance.\textsuperscript{112} PPO fumigation is the most cost effective means of pasteurization and therefore the most common.\textsuperscript{113}

B. The Delaney Clause: Are Carcinogens Permitted in Our Food?

Whether a carcinogen is permitted in food depends on whether it is deemed an "additive" or a "pesticide." If a carcinogen is deemed an additive, it is never permitted; but if a carcinogen is deemed a pesticide, it is allowed if it is found to be "safe." The Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act ("FFDCA") regulates "adulterated" foods.\textsuperscript{114} Adulterated food means delayed adverse health effects or would interfere with an individual's ability to escape from a dangerous atmosphere. Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response, 29 C.F.R. § 1910.120 (April 3, 2006).

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{105} Propylene Oxide; Tolerances for Residues, 40 C.F.R. § 180.491 (Dec. 6, 2007).
\item \textsuperscript{106} Almonds Grown in California, 7 C.F.R. § 981.442(b) (May 24, 2007).
\item \textsuperscript{107} 7 C.F.R. § 981.13.
\item \textsuperscript{108} 7 C.F.R. § 981.442(b)(6).
\item \textsuperscript{109} 7 C.F.R. § 981.442(b)(1).
\item \textsuperscript{111} 72 Fed. Reg. 15,021, 15,023.
\item \textsuperscript{112} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{113} Cornucopia Institute, Almond Fact Sheet, http://www.cornucopia.org/almond/Almond_Fact_Sheet.pdf (last accessed Dec. 17, 2007).
\item \textsuperscript{114} Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act ("FFDCA"), 21 U.S.C. § 301 (1938).
\end{itemize}
any food containing an unsafe food additive. A food additive is considered unsafe unless there is a specific regulation permitting its use. Under the so-called Delaney Clause of the FFDCA, no additive shall be deemed to be safe if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal. Even if an additive presents a de minimis cancer risk, its use is banned by the Delaney Clause.

PPO is known to cause cancer in animals and considered a probable human carcinogen by the EPA. So how under the Delaney Clause can it be used to fumigate almonds? The EPA is employing a 1996 loophole in the Delaney Clause that established a lower standard for pesticides. By treating PPO as an “insecticidal fumigant” rather than an additive, the EPA avoids the stringent Delaney Clause standard. Surprisingly, when almonds are fumigated in PPO for four hours in a de-pressurized vacuum chamber at 140°F, it does not become an “additive” in the EPA’s narrow interpretation of the term. But the EPA’s interpretation of “additive” seems inconsistent with Congress’s broad definition. Congress defined “additive” as:

any substance the intended use of which results or may reasonably be expected to result, directly or indirectly, in its becoming a component or otherwise affecting the characteristics of any food . . . including any substance intended for use in . . . processing, preparing, treating, packaging, transporting, or holding food; and . . . any source of radiation intended for any such use[.]

---

119. See supra notes 91-97 and accompanying text.
121. See Delaney Clause, supra note 117. While the regulations for food additives (21 U.S.C. §348) prohibit the use of any additive “found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal[,]” the regulations governing pesticide residue (21 U.S.C. 346(a)) contain no such blanket prohibition.
Where Congress has spoken directly to an issue, the agency must give effect to the unambiguously expressed intent of Congress.\textsuperscript{124} Considering Congress's definition of "additive," it appears that PPO is an additive in multiple respects. For example, when food is fumigated in a chemical for four hours, that chemical "may reasonably be expected to result, directly or indirectly, in its becoming a component . . . ."\textsuperscript{125} Also, PPO is used in the "treating, preparing and processing" of almonds, which would make it an "additive" within the broad definition of additive in the FFDCA.\textsuperscript{126} PPO also would fit the definition of additive because it "affects the characteristics" of almonds since it creates an acknowledged cancer risk and kills bacteria.\textsuperscript{127}

On the other hand, if PPO is deemed a pesticide, it would be regulated under the looser standards of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act ("FIFRA") and the Food Quality Protection Act ("FQPA").\textsuperscript{128} FIFRA defines antimicrobial pesticide as "a pesticide that . . . is intended to . . . disinfect, sanitize, reduce, or mitigate growth or development of microbiological organisms."\textsuperscript{129} PPO clearly fits this definition. But which definition should control, additive or pesticide?

This question was addressed by the FDA and USDA in a joint policy statement.\textsuperscript{130} Recognizing that the regulatory scheme applicable to PPO would depend on whether it was characterized as an additive or pesticide, they concluded that the determination would turn on where the application of PPO was made.\textsuperscript{131} If PPO was applied in a food processing facility, it would be treated as an additive under FFDCA and thus subject to the


\textsuperscript{125} This language is from the FFDCA's expansive definition of additive. 21 U.S.C. § 321(s).

\textsuperscript{126} This language also comes from the FFDCA's definition of additive. Id.

\textsuperscript{127} If PPO did not "affect the characteristics of almonds," it would not be used!


\textsuperscript{130} Legal and Policy Interpretation of the Jurisdiction Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of the Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency Over the Use of Certain Antimicrobial Substances, 63 FED. REG. 54,532 (Oct 9, 1998).

\textsuperscript{131} Id. at 54,537.
Delaney Clause. If it was applied on a raw agricultural commodity it would remain a FIFRA pesticide and thus the 1996 FQPA loophole to the Delaney clause would apply.

What is the rationale for treating a chemical differently based on the location of its application? While the policy statement is vague on this question, the answer seems to be simply regulatory efficiency. This does not seem to provide a satisfying explanation for why location should be the determinative factor in determining whether PPO is regulated as an additive or pesticide. Whether PPO is applied in a processing facility or a handling facility, almonds receive the same amount of PPO; yet PPO applied in a processing facility is considered an additive, and PPO applied in an almond handling facility is considered a pesticide. It is not clear why it should make a difference whether almonds are fumigated in a food processing facility or an almond handling facility.

C. Regulation of Propylene Oxide as a Pesticide Under the Food Quality Protection Act

1. The Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 ("FQPA")

After the passage of the FQPA, pesticides ceased to be regulated under the Delaney Clause, which forbade any pesticide known to "induce cancer when ingested by man or animal . . . ." Instead, under FQPA, a pesticide would be permitted if there was "a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue . . . ." If a pesticide was deemed "unsafe," it would still violate the Delaney Clause and not be permitted. Thus, because PPO was considered a pesticide, after 1996 the question became whether PPO was "safe" and if so, what residue tolerance would be permitted?

2. EPA Finds that Propylene Oxide Violates the Delaney Clause, Then Reverses Under Industry Pressure

In 1996, the EPA asked this question and found that PPO did, in fact, "induce cancer" within the meaning of the Delaney Clause, and therefore
was not "safe." It announced its intention to revoke PPO's "Food Additive Regulation," which had previously permitted its use. Even though PPO was treated under the new looser pesticide loophole, it still could not be deemed "safe" within the meaning of the FQPA.

Predictably, sellers and users of PPO rallied against the decision. Responding to industry pressure, the EPA reversed itself, setting a permissible residue level for PPO at 150 ppm. The EPA reasoned that "nuts treated with propylene oxide are not sold directly to consumers but are intended to be added to foods that may be further processed." The EPA further reasoned that if PPO levels were limited to 150 ppm, by the time the nuts got to the consumer, the level of PPO would drop to 3.3 ppm due to off-gassing. Such a level would produce a cancer risk of three in one million, which the EPA characterized as a "negligible risk."

139. "EPA, in general, interprets 'induces cancer' to mean: The carcinogenicity of a substance in animals is established when administration in an adequately designed and conducted study or studies results in an increase in the incidence of one or more types of malignant . . . neoplasms in treated animals compared to untreated animals maintained under identical conditions except for exposure to the test compound." EPA Revocation of Pesticide Food Additive Regulations, 61 FED. REG. 11,994, 11,998. (Mar. 22, 1996).

140. A Food Additive Regulation allows an additive to be used up to a certain residue "tolerance" level. PPO's tolerance level was 300 ppm. However, after the EPA's de minimis rule was struck down, the EPA was forced to re-evaluate its pesticide regulation and concluded that PPO violated the Delaney Clause. Id. at 12008.

141. Any additive "found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal" is not "safe" under the FQPA. 21 U.S.C. § 348(c)(3)(A).

142. "All of the comments received in response to this notice of filing supported the issuance of the proposed tolerance." Propylene Oxide; Pesticide Tolerance, 61 FED. REG. 25,152 (May 20, 1996).

143. Id. at 25, 153.

144. This assumption is no longer valid because under the new rule, all domestic almonds must be pasteurized, and PPO fumigation is the most common method of pasteurization. See Press Release, Cornucopia Institute, Almond Fact Sheet, http://www.cornucopia.org/almond/Almond_Fact_Sheet.pdf at 2 (last accessed Jan. 20, 2008).

145. Ppm means parts per million.

146. Propylene Oxide; Pesticide Tolerance, 61 FED. REG. 25,152 (May 20, 1996). The EPA admitted that more research was needed on off-gassing. Id. The ABC recommends that almonds be ventilated from two to five days after fumigation. California Almond Board, supra note 122. But during the harvest time crunch, when a handler is processing millions of pounds of almonds, is there any evidence that handlers are ventilating their almonds sufficiently? This author found none. This is one reason why the off-gassing data seems somewhat questionable.

147. Id.
In other words, under conservative estimates, only three out of one million people will get cancer in their lifetimes from PPO in almonds. With the current US population at 300 million, a PPO residue limit of 150 ppm could result in approximately 900 cancer cases.\textsuperscript{148} When we combine this information with the current mandatory pasteurization rule, there is a staggering disproportionality: only one person has ever died (and 129 sickened) from salmonella poisoning linked to almonds,\textsuperscript{149} but to prevent this from happening again, the EPA allows, and the USDA mandates, a pasteurization process that may result in 900 incidences of cancer.

The rationale behind the EPA's 1996 acceptance of PPO is no longer valid. No longer is PPO use limited to almonds that are merely components of other foods bound for further processing and not sold directly to consumers. Furthermore, while the use of PPO in 1996 was justified based on mitigating salmonella risk, today PPO is used on cooked almonds, which \textit{do not} pose a salmonella risk.\textsuperscript{150} While PPO might be justified to prevent the salmonella risk posed by non-organic raw almonds, it cannot be similarly justified when used on cooked almonds.\textsuperscript{151} Yet nonetheless, large producers like Blue Diamond and Paramount Farms use it nonetheless on their cooked almonds.\textsuperscript{152} In fact, the majority of almonds today are fumigated with PPO, even though ninety-five percent of them are cooked and pose no salmonella risk.\textsuperscript{153}

\begin{itemize}
\item[148.] Today the limit is 300 ppm. \textit{See} 40 C.F.R. § 180.491 (2007).
\item[149.] \textit{See supra} notes 60-61 and accompanying text.
\item[150.] "Ninety-five percent of almonds sold undergo processing, such as blanching, roasting or baking which eliminates any potential bacteria such as \textit{Salmonella Enteritidis}." Press Release, California Almond Board, California Almond Board Responds to Recall Regarding Raw, Natural Almonds, \textit{http://www.almondboard.com/News/pressreleasedetail.cfm?ItemNumber=582} (May 18, 2004).
\item[151.] Heat kills salmonella. \textit{See id.}
\end{itemize}
3. EPA Finds That Cancer Risk From Dietary Sources of PPO Exceed the Health Effects Division’s (“HED”) Level of Concern; Then Reverses Under Industry Pressure

In 2005, for a second time, the EPA concluded that propylene oxide should not be used, and for a second time, it reversed under industry pressure. A 2005 FDA memo stated that “the cancer dietary risk estimates for propylene oxide are above HED’s level of concern.”

Using two different models, the risk of cancer was found to be either 1.3 in 100,000 or 1.5 in every 100,000, either of which exceeded acceptable levels.

In response, industry lobbyist Aberco submitted a public comment urging that the EPA use a different method to calculate PPO’s potential cancer risk. Under Aberco’s approach, PPO came in under HED’s level of concern. Aberco’s comment was followed by thirty-seven other comments in support of Aberco from lobbyists and users of PPO, and one comment opposed.

The EPA agreed, adopting Aberco’s approach and revising its finding to state, “modified cancer slope factor results in dietary risk below HED’s

155. Id. at 52.
156. The FDA used a Dietary Exposure Evaluation Model (“DEEM”) and a Health and Lifeline model to estimate excess lifetime risk estimates. Id. at 53.
159. All comments available at http://www.regulations.gov/fdmspublic/component/main (enter Docket ID: EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0253). Negative comment states: “this product has the following negative effects on our world: known carcinogen, development toxicant, gastrointestinal toxicant, neurotoxicant, reproductive toxicant, respiratory toxicant, skin toxicant. . . . [I]t is clear that what is going on now is simply poisoning the earth and negatively affecting the health of the peoples of america [sic] and this world.” See Document ID: EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0253-0060.
level of concern.” Today, PPO may be used to fumigate almonds up to a residue concentration of 300 ppm.

### D. The Mislabeled, Food Labeling Act

The Rule raises two questions with regard to the Food Labeling Act: (1) When an almond is fumigated for four hours at 140°F in a vacuum chamber with a probable carcinogen, must the label reflect this fact?; and (2) When a raw almond has been subjected to 190°F water for two minutes, can that almond still be labeled as raw? Not surprisingly, the answer to both questions is probably no. One would think that a Food Labeling Act ("FLA") would require a label to accurately reflect the contents and condition of the food within. However, the Misbranded Food provision of the FLA is offended only if a label is false or misleading in a "material respect." Congress has not squarely addressed whether materiality in the FLA "pertains only to safety concerns or whether it also includes consumer interest." When Congress has not spoken directly to an issue in a statute, an agency has discretion in its construction of the statute, so long as the agency’s construction is faithful to the statute’s plain meaning, based on a permissible construction of the statute, and reasonable and consistent with the statutory scheme and legislative history. The question is, does FDA’s interpretation of “material” pass this test?

Currently, the FDA treats a fact as “material” only when it relates to an increased risk to consumer safety as defined by the FDA. If there is an

---

161. 40 C.F.R. § 180.491 (2007). It is not clear how or why the residue concentration limit was changed from 150 ppm to 300 ppm. Finding no record of this change in the Federal Register, this author made a Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") request to the FDA. In response, the FDA produced a memorandum. However, this author cannot discern from that memorandum how or why the residue concentration level was changed. That memorandum is on file with Liberty University Law Review.
166. Alliance for Bio-Integrity, 116 F.Supp.2d at 179 (“Thus, without a determination that . . . food[s] pose inherent risks . . . to consumers, or differ in some material way. . . , the
increased risk to consumers and consumers would likely want to know about the difference, then labeling is appropriate. 167 "If, however, the product does not differ in any significant way from what it purports to be, then it would be misbranding to label the product as different, even if consumers misperceive the product as different." 168 Of course whether or not a chemical constitutes an increased risk to consumer safety is determined by the agency. 169 This gives the FDA great latitude in labeling policy, and whatever its decision, it will receive deferential review because the reasoning behind labeling decisions are "characterized by scientific and technological uncertainty." 170

The FDA has not spoken to whether fumigating almonds in a probable carcinogen or cooking "raw" almonds in 190°F water for two minutes are material facts that must be disclosed on the label. Yet considering the FDA's treatment of irradiated foods, genetically modified foods, and pasteurized fruit juices, all signs point to no.

In 1986, the FDA mandated labeling of irradiated food on the basis of consumer interest alone, despite noting that there was "no concern about the safety of such treatment at the doses provided by [the] rule." 171 However today, the FDA claims that it does not have authority under the FDCA to mandate labeling solely on the basis of consumer interest. 172 Therefore, in

168. Id. This quotation comes out of Alliance for Bio-Integrity, but the court's use of "id." makes it unclear who is being quoted.
169. In some instances, an agency declares that they are not aware of any evidence of risk, when some of the research showing risk was done by the agency itself! See Mercola, infra note 176.
171. Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Food 51 FED. REG. 13,376, 13,388 (1986).
172. This marks a stark contrast to current FDA policy. Currently, the FDA claims that it does not have the legal authority to mandate labeling on the basis of consumer interest alone. See, e.g., Stauber v. Shalala, 895 F.Supp. 1178, 1193 (W.D. Wis. 1995). However, in 1986 the FDA argued vigorously that the FDCA did give it authority to mandate labeling on the "abstract worth of the information" and "whether consumers view such information as important and whether the omission of label information may mislead a consumer." See Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Food, 51 FED. REG. 13,376, 13,388. The FDA cites as examples its mandated labeling of bleached and bromated flour, enriched or fortified orange juice made from concentrate, potato chips made from
2007 the FDA proposed to only require labeling in cases where irradiation causes a material change in the sensory, nutritional, or functional properties of food.\(^{173}\) Under that proposal, even when labeling is required, the FDA will allow firms to petition to use the innocuous term "pasteurized" rather than irradiated.\(^{174}\) The FDA reasoned that while past labeling policy focused on conveying to consumers whether a food had been processed, today the focus is on the results of the processing rather than the processing itself.\(^{175}\) In deciding that irradiated foods in themselves do not present an increased risk to consumers, apparently the FDA discounted a substantial amount of research on the dangers of irradiated food—including research conducted by the FDA itself.\(^{176}\)

The FDA does not require special labeling for genetically modified foods ("GMO").\(^{177}\) It reasons that while many consumers are concerned about the long-term effects of GMOs, the FDA is not aware of "any data or other information that would form a basis for concluding that the fact that a food . . . was produced using bioengineering is a material fact that must be disclosed [under the FDCA]."\(^{178}\) Again it seems that a substantial amount of dehydrated potatoes, onion rings made from minced onions, and fish sticks made from minced fish. \(\text{Id.}\) Therefore, the FDA's current claim—that it does not have the legal authority under the FDCA to mandate labeling solely on the basis of consumer interest—rings hollow. More likely, the FDA does have the legal authority, but for policy reasons or political reasons, it does not choose to. See also Robert Streiffer & Alan Rubel, \textit{Genetically Engineered Animals and the Ethics of Food Labeling in LABELING GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD, THE PHILOSOPHICAL AND LEGAL DEBATE} 68 (2007); Thomas O. McGarity, \textit{Consumer Sovereignty, Federal Regulation, and Industry Control in Marketing and Choosing Food in the United States, in LABELING GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD, THE PHILOSOPHICAL AND LEGAL DEBATE} 139 (2007). But see Fred H. Degnan, \textit{Biotechnology and the Food Label}, in \textit{LABELING GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD, THE PHILOSOPHICAL AND LEGAL DEBATE} 27 (2007).


\(^{174}\) \textit{Id.} at 16,291. This is ironic because in 1996, the FDA concluded that using the term "pasteurization" to label irradiated food "probably would be misleading." Irradiation of Meat Food Products, 64 Fed. Reg. 72,150, 72,158 (1999).

\(^{175}\) \textit{Id.} at 16,295.

\(^{176}\) For a compilation of negative irradiation research, including one 1968 FDA study where irradiated food caused internal bleeding in rats, see Dr. Joseph Mercola, \textit{The Problems with Irradiated Food: What the Research Says}, http://www.mercola.com/article/irradiated/irradiated_research.htm (last accessed Dec. 18, 2007).


negative research failed to penetrate the FDA’s “awareness.” Nevertheless, the FDA provides guidance for “voluntary labeling . . . to ensure that labeling is truthful and not misleading.” While it may seem surprising that the FDA would put the truthfulness or misleading nature of labeling in the hands of the labeler, an agency’s decision not to enforce a statute is generally committed to that agency’s absolute discretion.

The FDA’s “concern” for the “confusion” of consumers is also reflected in its labeling policy on pasteurized and unpasteurized fruit juices. Here, the FDA reasoned that juices should not be labeled “unpasteurized” because:

- FDA was not aware of the extent to which consumers understand the terms “pasteurized” and “unpasteurized.” Thus, the agency is concerned that without effective consumer education, labeling untreated juice products as simply “unpasteurized” may not only have relatively little meaning to consumers but could even cause confusion. For example, some consumers, for example, may select unpasteurized juice believing that such juice is superior to pasteurized juice in that it is less processed.

Information should be kept from consumers lest it “confuse” them, causing them to make the “wrong” choice.

- If the FDA determines that irradiation of food, genetic modification of food, or the non-pasteurization of fruit juice is not a material fact that needs to be disclosed to the customer, then PPO fumigation and cooking of raw almonds are probably not either. Further, information about PPO or pasteurization might “confuse” consumers, causing them to erroneously conclude that a chemical free unprocessed food might be a healthier choice. And consumers who believe they are purchasing “raw” almonds might be “confused” by a label that indicates that their “raw” almonds have been cooked. Judging from this history, the words “propylene oxide” will probably not appear on almond labels any time soon.

---

179. See, e.g., Yasmine Phillips, New Health Alert on GM Foods, WEST AUSTRALIAN NEWSPAPERS, LTD. November 12, 2007 (“After working with more than 30 scientists over two years, Mr. Smith has pinpointed 65 health risks he says are directly and indirectly linked with genetically engineered food.”).

180. 66 FED. REG. 4839.


183. Ironically, if you are transporting propylene oxide, you must meet federal labeling requirements. See, e.g., 49 C.F.R. § 172.328 (October 1, 2005). Also ironic is the fact that there is a labeling requirement for unpasteurized almonds being shipped to processors in Canada, the U.S., or Mexico. See 7 C.F.R. § 981.442(b)(6)(i) (July 25, 2008).
E. Is the Rule Susceptible to Judicial Review?

Judicial review of administrative agencies is governed by the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"). In most instances, courts give agency decisions considerable deference. However, when an agency's action is contrary to the express will of Congress, no deference is given and agencies are susceptible to reversal.

When a court reviews agency actions under the APA, the reviewing court must hold an agency's actions unlawful if they are arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law. The reviewing court must conduct a "substantial inquiry" and determine whether the agency acted within the scope of its authority, "whether the decision was within the small range of available choices," and whether it could have "reasonably believed that there was no feasible alternative." The court must also consider "whether the decision was based on a consideration of the relevant factors, and whether there has been a clear error of judgment." The inquiry into the facts is to be "searching and careful." However the court should not substitute its judgment for that of the agency.

If Congress has spoken directly to the issue at hand, the agency must give effect to the unambiguously expressed intent of Congress. If, however, Congress has not directly addressed the issue at hand, the question for the court is "whether the agency's answer is based on a permissible construction of the statute." The agency's construction need not be the only permissible construction, or the construction favored by the court. Where Congress has made an explicit delegation of power, agency

185. "We have long recognized that considerable weight should be accorded to an executive department's construction of a statutory scheme it is entrusted to administer, and the principle of deference to administrative interpretations." Chevron U.S.A. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 467 U.S. 837, 843 (1984).
186. "If the intent of Congress is clear, that is the end of the matter; for the court, as well as the agency, must give effect to the unambiguously expressed intent of Congress." Id. at 842-43.
187. Id. This is not an exhaustive list of judicial review authority granted by the APA, but includes those elements that are relevant to the Rule.
189. Id. at 416.
190. Id.
191. Id.
193. Chevron, 467 U.S. at 843.
194. Id.
regulations are given "controlling weight unless they are arbitrary, capricious, or manifestly contrary to the statute." Where the delegation of power is implicit, the agency's construction of the statutory provision need only be reasonable. Considerable weight and deference should be given to an agency's statutory construction when decisions involve conflicting policies, or more than ordinary knowledge of the subject matter. A court must also give deference to agency choices that reflect a reasonable accommodation of conflicting policies committed to the agency by statute.

In sum, agency decisions are difficult to overturn. While there are many legal arguments against the Rule, most would probably not survive the deferential review afforded agencies. The exception is, however, an argument that the Rule contravenes the unambiguously expressed will of Congress. Such an argument would have the strongest chance of success, because if a court determines that an agency is acting contrary to the unambiguously expressed will of Congress, it will not give the agency judicial deference.

Considering the broad definition that Congress gave the term "additive" in the FFDCA, the USDA's choice to treat PPO as a pesticide appears to be contrary to the unambiguously expressed will of Congress. And because where "the intent of Congress is clear . . . the court . . . must give effect to the unambiguously expressed intent of Congress," if a court, in fact, found that the USDA's treating PPO as a pesticide was contrary to the express intent of Congress, it would overturn the designation, and PPO would be regulated as an additive. And since PPO is known to induce cancer in animals, the Delaney Clause would operate to forbid its use in food.

The decision to pasteurize all domestic almonds would be harder to overturn, since the USDA would receive deferential review in this area. It would be upheld unless it was arbitrary or capricious. The argument here is

195. Id.
196. Id at 844.
197. Id.
198. Id. at 845.
200. Id.
201. See supra notes 125-27 and accompanying text.
203. This reasoning applies to the use of PPO for pasteurization, and not, for example, in the field.
that the Rule is not rationally related to the ends of preventing salmonella because it applies to all almonds, when less than five percent of almonds—the non-organic raw almonds—actually pose a significant salmonella risk. The stated rationale for the Rule, the argument would run, is merely pretext. The real reason behind the Rule is that the big growers and handlers want to crush the growing market share of the small and organic growers. A more narrowly tailored approach, the challenger would argue, would be to focus on non-organic raw almonds, which are the source of the salmonella problem. And the proper solution would be mandating Good Agricultural Practices, not pasteurization, which are more effective at preventing salmonella than pasteurization.\(^\text{205}\)

Challenging the lack of a PPO labeling requirement would be difficult because Congress has made an implicit delegation of power to the regulators by not defining “material.”\(^\text{206}\) The agency would, therefore, receive deferential review. The lack of a PPO labeling requirement, however, could be challenged by arguing that the presence of PPO is a material fact under the FDA’s own definition.\(^\text{207}\) A fact is material, according to the FDA, if it relates to an increased risk to consumer safety.\(^\text{208}\) Since PPO is an acknowledged cancer risk, it does pose an increased risk to consumer safety and thus constitutes a material fact requiring labeling.

Challenging the FDA’s policy allowing almonds to be labeled as “raw,” when they are in fact cooked, would be equally difficult. While labeling a cooked almond as raw is clearly misleading, it does not constitute a “material fact” as it is defined by the FDA because it does not present an increased health risk. Since the FDA would receive deference here, and since an agency’s decision not to enforce a statute is generally afforded absolute discretion, a challenge here would likely fail.\(^\text{209}\)

**IV. CRITIQUE OF THE RULE**

The stated purpose of the Rule is to protect the consumer. But are safety concerns really just a pretext to benefit the big growers and handlers?

\(^{205}\) See *Chevron*, 467 U.S. at 843.

\(^{206}\) See *supra* notes 163-64 and accompanying text.

\(^{207}\) The FDA, not the EPA, would regulate labeling of almonds.

\(^{208}\) Food Labeling; Protein Products; Warning Labeling, 49 Fed. Reg. 13,679 (April 6, 1984).

\(^{209}\) See *supra* notes 192-98 and accompanying text.
A. Rule Favored by Large Almond Producers and Handlers; Condemned by Small and Organic Growers, Consumers, and Proprietors of Raw Almonds

The large growers uniformly favor the Rule. Almonds are a $2 billion industry, and no one wants the bad press and diminished sales that another salmonella outbreak might bring, even though previous outbreaks have had no impact on demand. Dave Pippen, former chairman of the ABC, says that "[w]ith an outbreak we would have a blemish on the California almond name whether organic or not." The ABC also cites the need to "ensure that consumers are provided with safe, wholesome food products, free from potentially harmful levels of bacteria that can cause illness, without compromising the almond qualities and attributes that consumers expect and appreciate."

Almond handlers are downright ebullient about the new Rule. Handlers have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in pasteurization equipment and expect to make hundreds of thousands in profit. "It's awesome," said one handler. "We've invested quite a lot of money in this to get it up and running. It means a lot to us."

Small almond growers complain that "they have lost tens of thousands of dollars in sales, experienced higher than expected processing costs, and are seeing store shelves now carrying foreign almonds where their product used to be on display. Some worry that they may go out of business."

---

211. Loretta Kalb, Salmonella Recall Doesn't Hurt Almond Sales, SACRAMENTO BEE (June 8, 2004).
212. Id. Mr. Phippen, in his statement, implicitly acknowledges that the rule is not needed to prevent salmonella outbreaks among the small and organic growers.
214. Robert Rodriguez, Almond Processors Oppose Delay of Program, Board Proposes that USDA Bump the Sept. 1 Start Date for Mandatory Pasteurization to March 1. SACRAMENTO BEE (August 7, 2007).
215. Dennis Pollock, Sept. 1 Start to Pasteurize Raw Almonds is Affirmed, Madera Nut Processor Is Pleased USDA Rejects Bid to Delay Implementation, SACRAMENTO BEE (August 22, 2007). The handler quoted invested $1,000,000 in pasteurization equipment.
drive the small guy out of business.” They point out that small and organic almond growers, which primarily focus on the raw almond market, will be disadvantaged because consumers of raw organic almonds, including purveyors of foods that include raw organic almonds as a component, are being forced to buy from Italy, Spain, and Turkey. They are turning to imported almonds because the Rule requires domestic almonds to be either blanched (rendering them cooked), or fumigated with PPO (rendering them not organic). The Rule does not require pasteurization of imported almonds.

Critics also complain that the small growers cannot afford the expense of pasteurization. The cost of a typical steam treatment line ranges from $525,000 to $800,000. The cost of a propylene oxide chamber ranges from $500,000 to $1,250,000. Outsourcing pasteurization, critics complain, could cost small growers four to five times more than what an industrial-scale producer would pay because processors charge flat rates. Transportation costs required by outsourcing pasteurization are also cited as a concern.

B. Eight Reasons Why the Rule Does Not Reflect Sound Policy

1. The Rule is Over-Inclusive

Salmonella is only a concern in raw almonds. This is because heat eliminates the threat of salmonella in cooked almonds. Thus, ninety-five percent of almonds sold in the United States undergo processing, such as blanching, roasting or baking which eliminates any potential bacteria such as Salmonella Enteritidis.”

218. Id.
219. Id.
220. 7 C.F.R. § 981.
221. Id.
222. “This rule provides for a mandatory program to reduce the potential for Salmonella bacteria in almonds.” 72 FED. REG. 15,021, 15,022.
223. Id. at 15,026.
225. Id.
227. “Ninety-five percent of almonds sold in the United States undergo processing, such as blanching, roasting or baking which eliminates any potential bacteria such as Salmonella Enteritidis.” Id.
percent of almonds sold in the United States, because they are cooked, pose no threat of salmonella.\textsuperscript{228} If there is no salmonella risk, then there is no reason to pasteurize.\textsuperscript{229} Yet, cooked almonds and raw almonds alike must be pasteurized.\textsuperscript{230} For this reason alone, the Rule is over-inclusive.

However, the Rule is also over-inclusive because it applies to growers of raw organic almonds, as well as non-organic raw almonds. Non-organic raw almond growers use raw manure for fertilizer,\textsuperscript{231} a practice not recommended by the ABC,\textsuperscript{232} but not forbidden.\textsuperscript{233} Using raw manure makes almonds susceptible to salmonella.\textsuperscript{234} The only two salmonella outbreaks linked to almonds both originated from non-organic raw almond growers.\textsuperscript{235}

In contrast, the stringent farming techniques \textit{required} of organic farmers prevent raw manure from being used with crops.\textsuperscript{236} Furthermore, the sustainable farming techniques used by organic growers, which include mowing and mulching rather than controlling weeds by chemical herbicide applications, naturally prevent the spread of harmful bacteria more effectively.\textsuperscript{237} As one grower put it, "[a]n organic farming system fosters

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{228} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{229} The only justification given for pasteurization is salmonella prevention. No salmonella risk, no justification.
\item \textsuperscript{230} With minor exceptions discussed \textit{supra} in notes 107-108 and accompanying text, "handlers shall subject their almonds to a treatment process or processes prior to shipment to reduce potential Salmonella bacteria contamination . . . ." 7 C.F.R. § 981.442(b)(1).
\item \textsuperscript{231} Anna Belle Peevey, \textit{New Pasteurization Regulations Have Raw Food Growers Heated}, \textsc{Alameda Star Times} (Dec. 2, 2007).
\item \textsuperscript{232} Linda Romander, \textit{Almond Orchard Food Safety Link}, \textsc{Western Farm Press} (Aug. 6, 2005).
\item \textsuperscript{233} The ABC's Food Quality and Safety Program is voluntary. \textit{See Almond Board of California Food Quality and Safety Program}, http://www.almondboard.com/files/PDFs/FQSP_GAPs.pdf (last accessed Jan. 20, 2008).
\item \textsuperscript{234} "Use of raw animal manure that has not been treated significantly increases the risk of microbiological contaminants." \textit{Id} at 29.
\item \textsuperscript{235} \textit{See McAfee Farms and Organic Pastures Dairy, supra} note 12.
\item \textsuperscript{236} "Raw animal manure must either be composted, applied to land used for a crop not intended for human consumption, or incorporated into the soil at least 90 days before harvesting an edible product that does not come into contact with the soil or soil particles and at least 120 days before harvesting an edible product that does come into contact with the soil or soil particles." The National Organic Program, \textit{Production and Handling, Subpart C - Organic Crop, Wild Crop, Livestock, and Handling Requirements, Crop Production}, http://www.ams.usda.gov/nop/NOP/standards/ProdHandPre.html (last accessed Jan. 20, 2008).
\item \textsuperscript{237} Press Release, USDA Plan to "Pasteurize" Almonds Has Consumers Going Nuts: Mandate Would Require Use of Chemical Fumigant or Heat Treatment on "Raw" Almonds.
\end{enumerate}
biodiversity and creates an environment where salmonella cannot survive." The efficacy of the organic farmer's technique is evidenced by the fact that there has never been a salmonella incident linked to organic almonds. Since organic growers are already required to follow stringent farming techniques that prohibit the use of raw manure, the justification behind pasteurizing non-organic raw almonds does not support pasteurizing organic raw almonds.

2. The Rule is Under-Inclusive

The Rule does not require imported raw almonds to be pasteurized, only domestic raw almonds. Now that truly raw organic domestic almonds are not available, consumers are turning to imported almonds. The Rule, therefore, does not eliminate raw unpasteurized almonds from the food supply—it only prevents American farmers from supplying them.

3. Good Agricultural Practices, Not Pasteurization, is the Most Effective Way to Prevent Salmonella

Salmonella is better prevented by utilizing Good Agricultural Practices ("GAP") in the orchard, rather than by pasteurization. Pasteurization is an attempt to address the problem, not the cause. GAP is short for a list of best practices recommended by the ABC to protect almonds by targeting the main sources of almond contamination: poor quality water or poor moisture management that favors microbial growth; failure to properly compost manure fertilizer if used (manure is not recommended); the presence of fecal material from wild animals, livestock, or pets; and poor human hygiene practices.

For non-organic growers, following GAP is voluntary. While the occurrence of salmonella in almonds is very rare, the most effective place
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238. Id.
239. Id.
241. "The mode of industrial agriculture," [one organic farmer] said, 'is that instead of addressing the cause, they deal with the problems.' "Peevey, supra note 231.
242. Romander, supra note 232.
to prevent it is in the orchard, not by pasteurization. When it comes to salmonella, the orchard is the "weakest link" in the chain from producer to consumer. In fact, if producers do not follow GAP, pasteurization may not be enough to prevent salmonella. While most growers follow GAP, some do not. Mandatory pasteurization may even cause growers to become complacent in implementing GAP due to a false sense of security provided by pasteurization. Pasteurization could therefore increase, rather than decrease, the risk of salmonella.

4. The Rule Creates a Greater Risk Than It Prevents

The EPA's current estimate of cancer incidence from dietary PPO consumption is four in ten million. Under that estimate, with the current U.S. population swelling above three hundred million, it is possible that over one hundred people will get cancer from consuming PPO fumigated almonds. Most people who contract salmonella, experience diarrhea, fever, and abdominal cramps for four to seven days, and recover without treatment. Considering that only one person has ever died from salmonella linked to almonds, a regulation that may cause over one hundred incidences of cancer cannot be justified. Especially when ninety-five percent of the almonds that may be pasteurized with PPO are cooked and therefore do not even pose a salmonella risk.

245. Romander, supra note 232.
246. According to Linda Harris, Cooperative Extension specialist in microbial food safety, Department of Food Science and Technology, UC-Davis, "[i]f a handler receives almonds from growers or hullers and shellers who did not practice GAPs and GMPs (good manufacturing practices), a pasteurization process that provides a five-log reduction of bacteria such as Salmonella may not be sufficient to eliminate all contamination[.]"] Id.
247. Id.
248. It was 1.3 in 100,000 or 1.5 in every 100,000, but then changed to 4 in 10,000,000, the current number, following pressure from industry lobbyist Aberco. See supra notes 154-61, and accompanying text. For the current post Aberco risk assessment level, see, EPA, PROPYLENE OXIDE: RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE HED RISK ASSESSMENT FOR PROPYLENE OXIDE; PC CODE 042501; DP BARCODE; 329650, http://www.regulations.gov/fdmspublic/component/main at 2 (enter document ID: EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0253-0057) (posted June 30, 2006).
250. See California Almond Board, supra note 11.
5. The Rule Unjustifiably Denies Consumers the Right to Choose the Foods They Deem Most Beneficial

Consumers should be able to choose whether they would rather take a risk with salmonella or cancer. The Rule was promulgated in the name of protecting consumers—but no consumers demanded protection. In fact, the Rule was pushed by the big growers and handlers, and received only eighteen public comments—none of which came from consumers. Now that consumers have become aware of the Rule, half of all comments coming in to the Secretary of Agriculture are on almonds.

Many health-conscious consumers do not want their almonds fumigated with PPO or their raw almonds cooked. But the Rule deprives consumers of this choice. This is particularly worrisome to Raw Foodists and vegetarians, some of whom rely on almonds to provide up to thirty percent of their caloric intake, believing that they are a nutritionally superior alternative to meat. Raw foods are also a religious concern to some, including Seventh-Day Adventists.

6. The Rule Creates an Undue and Unjustifiable Burden on Small and Organic Growers

Techniques used by some commercial growers of non-organic raw almonds, such as use of raw manure, make their almonds susceptible to salmonella contamination. In contrast, organic growers of raw almonds are required to use more stringent techniques, and are not permitted to use raw manure with their almonds. Yet while they are the least likely to be

254. Unless you happen to live in California near a small organic farmer who sells his own unpasteurized almonds in a roadside stand.
255. Cornucopia Institute, supra note 252.
256. Id. Arguing that the almond rule violates the Establishment Clause or the Religious freedom act would probably fail because, “neutral laws of general applicability do not violate the Free Exercise Clause, even if the laws incidentally burden religion or the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.” Alliance for Bio-Integrity, 116 F. Supp. 2d 166, 179.
257. See supra notes 231-35 and accompanying text.
258. See supra notes 236-39 and accompanying text.
the sources of salmonella, organic raw almond growers bear the largest
burden from the Rule. This is because, in addition to their more costly
farming techniques, flat rates charged by many handlers mean that growers
who produce fewer almonds will pay proportionally higher costs to have
their almonds pasteurized. These growers present the lowest risk of
salmonella, yet the Rule imposes the greatest burden on them. It is unfair to
impose a disproportionate burden on organic raw almond growers, who
already are required to do more and spend more to avoid the problem, when
it is the non-organic growers who pose the greatest risk of salmonella.

7. The Rule is Reactionary

Regulators have tremendous rulemaking power that can have powerful
effects on industries and consumers. They should not wield these powers on
a whim, but based on meaningful metrics. There are 40,000 reported cases
of salmonella poisoning per year and unreported cases may number as
much as thirty times more. The Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention estimate that approximately 400 people die each year from
salmonella. How can the USDA justify a rule that results in the
pasteurization of over one billion pounds of almonds a year, denies
consumers the choice to buy unpasteurized almonds, and puts a probable
carcinogen into the food supply, in response to 130 illnesses and one death?
What response to the other 39,870 illnesses and 599 deaths? A more
meaningful threshold is needed to prevent arbitrary use of regulatory
power.

8. Designating Propylene Oxide as a Pesticide Contravenes the
Unambiguous Intent of Congress

Where Congress has spoken directly to an issue, an administrative
agency must give effect to the unambiguously expressed intent of
Congress. PPO appears to meet Congress's broad definition of

259. Because many handlers charge a flat rate, small growers may wind up paying up to
four or five times than industrial-scale producers. Press Release, Cornucopia Institute,
USDA Plan to “Pasteurize” Almonds Has Consumers Going Nuts: Mandate Would Require
260. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, How COMMON IS SALMONELLOSIS?,
http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/dbmd/diseaseinfo/salmonellosis_g.htm#How%20common%20is
%20salmonellosis (accessed Dec 20, 2007).
261. Id.
additive. Yet the USDA regulates PPO as an insecticide based on the location of where it is applied. This decision appears to be based solely on administrative convenience, as there is no conceivable reason (the USDA gave none) why location of application relates to whether PPO is a pesticide or an additive.

V. PROPOSAL

A. Premise Behind Proposal: U.S. Regulation ofEnvironmental Toxins Needs Improvement

The leader of the Free World leads the Western World in preventable disease. With disease, establishing causation is problematic, but there is strong circumstantial evidence that the U.S.'s regulation of environmental toxins, including the kind we ingest in our food, needs improvement. The U.S. has a history of willingly accepting new technologies, while regarding traditional foods with suspicion. This attitude correlates with rising rates of disease. In contrast, Europe, which favors traditional foods, less processing, and takes a skeptical view toward new technology, enjoys lower rates of disease.

Rates of diseases that are closely associated with environmental toxins are rising at alarming levels. The data supports a strong inference that we are moving in the wrong direction. The U.S. ranks forty-second in life expectancy, down from eleventh decades ago. In the U.S., from 1950, the
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263. See supra note 124-28 and accompanying text.
264. See supra note 130-36 and accompanying text.
265. Nicholas Timmins, US Leads on Deaths From Treatable Disease, FIN. TIMES, (Jan 8, 2008).
268. Id.
269. See infra notes 271-81.
270. Stephen Olemacher, 41 Nations Top US Life Expectancy, SEATTLE TIMES, (Aug. 12, 2007). Some use these statistics to argue for universal health care. This Note focuses on the factors that cause disease. Health care focuses on what to do once disease is contracted. As long as we continue to allow the presence of disease causing environmental toxins in our
beginning of the synthetic chemical revolution, to 2001 the incidence for all types of cancer increased by eighty-five percent. Since 1950, skin melanoma is up 690%; thyroid cancer is up 258%; Non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma is up 249%; liver and intrahepatic cancer is up 234%; and kidney and renal pelvis cancer is up 182%.

Non-cancer diseases are also on the rise. Fourteen years ago, autism affected one in 10,000 children. Today, that number has grown to an astonishing one in 150. Research now shows that Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder may be linked to chemical additives in food. Dementia in the elderly is growing at epidemic rates. "Pediatric asthma rates are reaching epidemic proportions." Toxic chemicals linked to developmental disorders, thyroid problems, and cancer have been found in the breast milk of mothers. Up thirty-one percent since 1981, one in eight
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food and environment, health care will not reduce the incidence of disease. Health care only relates to survival rates.

271. New technology introduced in the 1940’s called thermal and catalytic cracking allowed scientists through molecular splicing and recombination to produce any chemical they wanted. By the 1950’s the U.S. produced 50-billion pounds of new synthetic chemicals. By the late 1980s, we produced 500 billion pounds. Most of these chemicals have never been tested for toxic, carcinogenic, or environmental effects. Randall Fitzgerald, THE HUNDRED-YEAR LIE: HOW TO PROTECT YOURSELF FROM THE CHEMICALS THAT ARE DESTROYING YOUR HEALTH 30-31 (Penguin Group 2007).

272. Id. at 31. This figure is age-adjusted, which means that the increase is not explained by people living longer.

273. Id.

274. See, e.g., Michael Szpir, Tracing the Origins of Autism: A Spectrum of New Studies, ENVR. HEALTH PERSPECTIVES A412, (2006), available at http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?pubmedid=16835042 (last accessed Jan. 23, 2008). Some scientists credit the increase to increased awareness of autism, or of the diagnostic criteria, but other say it is too soon to say. Id. While scientists disagree on the importance of genetic versus environmental factors in causing autism, an increase in incidents of autism, and not merely reporting, would argue in favor of environmental factors. Id. at A413. Little research has been done. Id. There are, however, cases that have been “clearly linked” to environmental insults. Id.
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279. Patti Truant, Toxic Chemicals Making Their Way into Mother’s Breast Milk, NATION’S HEALTH, Vol. 25, Issue 9, 19 (November 11, 2005). This is a study of mothers in the U.S. and Canada.
babies are born premature; a "silent epidemic" and a sign that something is wrong, say advocates. In a recent study on the presence of environmental toxins in blood, all thirty participants have had high levels of toxic substances, including phthalates, bisphenol-A, and polybrominated diphenyl ethers, or PBDEs.

Pasteurization and the sterile Western diet may be to blame for the recent epidemic in asthma and allergies. The "Hygiene Hypothesis" holds that it is the lack of exposure to the natural environment teeming with hostile bacteria and parasites that cause our body to have exaggerated responses to things like peanuts, shrimp, and ragweed. Interestingly, populations of undeveloped countries are not suffering from the industrialized world's allergy epidemic. The correlation between overly sterile diets and poor health would seem to counsel against widespread pasteurization of foods.

We are often told that a given chemical is not dangerous, because the dose is so small. However, sometimes small doses are dangerous. For example, five parts per billion of polychlorinated biphenyls ("PCB") is enough to cause permanent brain damage to a fetus in the womb. The "danger is in the dose" rationale also fails to consider how a chemical will react with the myriad other chemicals we have in our body. For example, one study showed how two or more chemicals in combination could increase overall toxic effects, even when there was a separation of 200 days between one chemical being added and the next. Another study showed how monosodium glutamate ("MSG") combined with common artificial colors and chemicals typically found in a child's bloodstream after a snack, interact to interfere with normal development of nerve cells, increasing the toxic effect of the chemical alone by seven times. Furthermore, much of the chemical onslaught we ingest cannot be rapidly metabolized by our body.

281. These chemicals have been linked to birth defects, infertility, and learning disabilities. William Hathaway, Be Afraid of What Your Made of, Study Says, THE HARTFORD COURANT A1 (Nov. 9, 2007).
283. Id.
285. Id. at 30-31.
286. Id. at 36.
287. Id. at 37. For a list of similar alarming studies about the dangerous of chemical synergies see Id.
livers and kidneys, accumulating inside of us, eventually impairing our health.\textsuperscript{288}

In short, the U.S. population is experiencing wide-ranging increases in health problems. While admittedly, there are many factors and causality is hard to establish, when disease increases, and genetics have not changed, there is a strong inference that environmental factors are to blame. Our permissive regulation of environmental toxins\textsuperscript{289} almost certainly contributes to those environmental factors. At the very least, the wide-ranging increase in disease argues that more caution is warranted before we proliferate more chemicals into our bodies, our food, and our environment.

\subsection*{B. U.S. Administrative Agencies Should Follow the Precautionary Principle}

As the almond rule demonstrates, federal regulators are not immune to manipulation by big business and are quite capable of creating policies that do more harm than good. In part, this is because Congress has not given agencies a guiding principle that would incline agencies toward more reasoned and less reactionary regulation.

The precautionary principle may be a solution to that omission. It is a moral and political risk management principle used in European food and environmental law to ensure that when faced with scientific uncertainty, regulatory action (or inaction) does not do more harm than good.\textsuperscript{290} While a definitive statement of the precautionary principle has yet to be developed, the author suggests the following version for the regulation of environmental toxins and food additives:

\begin{quote}
If there is insufficient scientific evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a proposed environmental toxin or food additive will not adversely affect human health, that substance should not be approved, or if it is approved, products containing that substance should be conspicuously labeled, and an unadulterated alternative should be permitted.\textsuperscript{291}
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{288} Id. at 28-29.
\textsuperscript{289} "Ninety-five percent of all chemicals have never undergone testing for their toxicity or environmental impact." Mark Shapiro, \textit{EXPOSED: THE TOXIC CHEMISTRY OF EVERYDAY PRODUCTS, WHO'S AT RISK AND WHAT'S AT STAKE FOR AMERICAN POWER} 132 (2007).
\textsuperscript{291} This articulation of the precautionary principle is not derived from any particular source and is purely a product of the author.
\end{flushright}
Critics of the precautionary principle argue that it is paralyzing, "forbidding inaction, stringent regulation, and everything in between because all societal decisions, including the decision not to act at all, entail risks of harm."\textsuperscript{292} One critic offers the following illustration:

Global warming \textit{may} occur, resulting in a broad range of potential harms. Here, many environmental activists call for a drastic reduction in the emission of greenhouse gases, pursuant to the Precautionary Principle. However, reducing greenhouse gas emissions would entail stunning economic costs, diverting money from many health programs and putting at risk the lives of countless world citizens.\textsuperscript{293}

Indeed the result suggested in the illustration—putting lives at risk to fund global warming mitigation—would be absurd; but the precautionary principle does not have to be carried to absurdity. Any principle, carried to its logical extreme, yields absurd results. But the principle can be applied with judgment and discretion, and not, thereby, yield absurd results.

If the precautionary principle articulated above were applied to the almond issue, one of two things would happen: The USDA would forbid the use of PPO in food, because of the uncertainty regarding its safety, as much of the rest of the world has done.\textsuperscript{294} Or, if PPO were to be allowed, products containing it would be labeled, and consumers who are concerned about carcinogens would have the information and the freedom to choose the food that they believe is most beneficial to them. Consumers would have the information and the autonomy to choose between a salmonella risk and a cancer risk. Such a result would better protect the liberty of consumers and entrepreneurs.\textsuperscript{295} Should not important choices with such profound effect on our liberty be in the hands of people, rather than the government?

\textsuperscript{292} James M. Taylor, \textit{Liberal Academic Shoots Down Precautionary Principle}, \textit{The Heartland Institute} (July 1, 2002) available at http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=902. Cass Sunstein is a well-known professor at the University of Chicago School of Law.

\textsuperscript{293} Id.

\textsuperscript{294} See Cornucopia Institute, \textit{supra} note 94 and accompanying text.

\textsuperscript{295} The application of the precautionary principle to food regulation would also allow for the return of raw milk, raw butter, and raw cheese—formerly known as milk, cheese, and butter.
VI. CONCLUSION

One who did not have a stake in the almond controversy might simply conclude, “Oh well, . . . just eat something else.” But almonds are only the latest on a long list of foods that are not permitted in their natural, unadulterated form.296 The “pasteurize everything” movement is gaining steam. Where will chemical-adverse consumers get their food if regulators do not leave the door open to alternatives?

The Rule discussed in this Note injures liberty in three ways: (1) It deprives consumers of the opportunity to choose the food they believe is most beneficial to them; (2) it places a probable carcinogen in the food supply that may destroy a person’s health, a necessary condition for enjoying liberty; and (3) it limits the freedom of entrepreneurs to offer the goods that they believe their consumers demand. It is just one example of how regulators have too much power and too much discretion. Congress should institute the precautionary principle as a guiding dictate for regulators, so that their regulations will not do more harm to human health, liberty, and autonomy, than good.297
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296. Natural butter, milk, and cheese are the most prominent examples. See supra note 8 and accompanying text.
297. At the time of publication, a case was pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia filed by a group of almond growers and handlers challenging the validity of the Rule. Koretoff v. Schaeffer, No. 1:2008cv01558 (D.C.C. filed Sept. 9, 2008).