

Genetic Engineering and the Concept of the Natural

Mark Sagoff

Why do many consumers view genetically engineered foods with suspicion? I want to suggest that it is largely because the food industry has taught them to do so. Consumers learn from advertisements and labels that the foods they buy are all natural—even more natural than a baby's smile. "The emphasis in recent years," *Food Processing* magazine concludes, "has been on natural or nature-identical ingredients." According to *Food Product Design*, "the desire for an all natural label extends even to pet food."

The food industry, I shall argue, wishes to embrace the efficiencies offered by advances in genetic engineering. This technology, both in name and in concept, however, belies the image of nature or of the natural to which the food industry constantly and conspicuously appeals. It should be no surprise that consumers who believe genetically modified foods are not "natural" should for that reason regard them as risky or as undesirable. If they knew how much technology contributes to other foods they eat, they might be suspicious of them as well.

All-Natural Technology

Recently, I skimmed through issues of trade magazines, such as *Food Technology* and *Food Processing*, that serve the food industry. In full-page advertisements, manufacturers insist the ingredients they market come direct from primordial Creation or, at least, that their products are identical to nature's own. For example, Roche Food Colours runs in these trade magazines a full-page ad that displays a bright pink banana over the statement: "When nature changes her colours, so will we." The ad continues:

Today more and more people are rejecting the idea of artificial colours being used in food and drink....

Our own food colours are, and always have been, strictly identical to those produced by nature.

We make pure carotenoids which either singly or in combination achieve a whole host of different shades in the range of yellow through orange to red.

And time and time again they produce appetising natural colours, reliably, economically, and safely.

Just like nature herself.

Advertisement after advertisement presents the same message: food comes directly from nature or, at least, can be sold as if it did. Consider, for example, a full-page advertisement that McCormick and Wild, a flavor manufacturer, runs regularly in *Food Processing*. The words "BACK TO NATURE" appear under a kiwi fruit dripping with juice. "Today's consumer wants it all," the advertisement purrs, "great taste, natural ingredients, and new ideas. . . . Let us show you how we can put the world's most advanced technology in natural flavors at your disposal. . . ."

This advertisement clearly states the mantra of the food industry: "Today's consumer wants it all." Great taste. Natural ingredients. New ideas. The world's most advanced technology. One can prepare the chemical basis of a flavor, for example, benzaldehyde—almond—artificially with just a little chemical know-

The terms "natural" and "patented" fit seamlessly together in a conceptual scheme in which there are no trade-offs and no compromises.

how, in this instance, by mixing oil of clove and amyl acetate. To get exactly the same compound as a "natural" flavor, one must employ far more sophisticated technology to extract and isolate benzaldehyde from peach and apricot pits. The "natural" flavor, an extract, contains traces of hydrogen cyanide, a deadly poison evolved by plants to protect their seeds from insects. Even so, consumers strongly prefer all-natural to artificial flavors, which sell therefore at a far lower price.

In its advertisements, the Haarmann & Reimer Corporation (H&R) describes its flavor enhancers as "HypR Clean Naturally." With "H&R as your partner, you'll discover the latest advances in flavor technology" that assure "the cleanest label possible." A "clean" label is one that includes only natural ingredients and no reference to technology. In a competing advertisement, Chr. Hansen's Laboratory announces itself as the pioneer in "culture and enzyme technologies. . . . And because our flavors are completely nat-

ural, you can enjoy the benefits of 'all-natural' labeling." Flavor manufacturers tout their stealth technology—i.e., technology so advanced it disappears from the consumer's radar screen. The consumer can be told he or she is directly in touch with nature itself.

The world's largest flavor company, International Flavors & Fragrances (IFF) operates manufacturing facilities in places like Dayton, New Jersey, an industrial corridor of refineries and chemical plants. Under a picture of plowed, fertile soil, the IFF Laboratory, in a full-page display, states, "Where Nature is at work, IFF is at work." The text describes "IFF's natural flavor systems." The slogan follows: "IFF technology. In partnership with Nature." Likewise, MEER Corporation of Bergen, New Jersey, pictures a rainforest under the caption, "It's A Jungle Out There!" The ad states that "true-to-nature" flavorings "do not just happen. It takes . . . manufacturing and technical expertise and a national distribution network . . . for the creation of natural, clean label flavors."

Food colors are similarly sold as both all natural and high tech. "VegetoneH colors your foods *naturally* for a healthy bottom line," declares Kalsec, Inc., of Kalamazoo, Michigan. Its ad shows a technician standing before a computer and measuring chemicals into a test tube. The ad extols the company's "patented natural color systems." The terms "natural" and "patented" fit seamlessly together in a conceptual scheme in which there are no trade-offs and no compromises. The natural is patentable. If you think any of this is contradictory, you will not get far in the food industry.

Organic TV Dinners

As a typical American suburbanite, I can buy not just groceries but "Whole Foods" at Fresh Fields and other upscale supermarkets. I am particularly impressed by the number of convenience foods that are advertised as "organic." Of course, one might think that any food may be whole and that all foods are organic. Terms like "whole" and "organic," however, appeal to and support my belief that the products that carry these labels are less processed and more natural—closer to the family farm—than are those that are produced by multinational megacorporations, such as Pillsbury or General Foods.

My perusal of advertisements in trade magazines helped disabuse me of my belief that all-natural, organic, and whole foods are closer to nature in a substantive sense than other manufactured products. If I had any residual credulity, it was removed by an excellent cover story, "Behind the Organic-Industrial Complex," that appeared in a recent issue of the *New York Times Magazine*. The author, Michael Pollan, is shocked, shocked to find that the prepackaged

microwavable all-natural organic TV dinners at his local Whole Foods outlet are not gathered from the wild by red-cheeked peasants in native garb. They are highly-processed products manufactured by multinational corporations. Contrary to the impression created by advertisements, organic and other all-natural foods are often fabricated by the same companies—using comparable technologies—as those that produce Velveeta and Miracle Whip. And the ingredients come from as far away as megafarms in Chile—not from local farmers' markets.

Reformers who led the organic food movement in the 1960s wished to provide an alternative to agribusiness and to industrial food production, but some of

Consumers inspect food labels to ward off artificial ingredients; yet they also want the convenience of a low-priced, pre-prepared, all-natural dinner.

these reformers bent to the inevitable. As Pollan points out, they became multimillionaire executives of Pillsbury and General Mills in charge of organic food production systems. This makes sense. A lot of advanced technology is needed to produce and market an all-natural or an organic ready-to-eat meal. Consumers inspect food labels to ward off artificial ingredients; yet they also want the convenience of a low-priced, pre-prepared, all-natural dinner.

At General Mills, as one senior vice president, Danny Strickland, told Pollan, "Our corporate philosophy is to give consumers what they want with no trade-offs." Pollan interprets the meaning of this statement as follows. "At General Mills," Pollan explains, "the whole notion of objective truth has been replaced by a value-neutral consumer constructivism, in which each sovereign shopper constructs his own reality."

Mass-marketed organic TV dinners do not compromise; they combine convenience with a commitment to the all-natural, eco-friendly, organic ideology. The most popular of these dinners are sold by General Mills through its subsidiary, Cascadian Farms. The advertising slogan of Cascadian Farms, "Taste You Can Believe In," as Pollan observes, makes no factual claims of any sort. It "allows the consumer to bring his or her personal beliefs into it," as the Vice President for Marketing, R. Brooks Gekler, told Pollan. The absence of any factual claim is essential to selling a product, since each consumer buys an object that reflects his or her particular belief system.

What is true of marketing food is true of virtually every product. A product will sell if it is all-natural and eco-friendly and, at the same time, offers the con-

sumer the utmost in style and convenience. A recent *New York Times* article, under the title, "Fashionistas, Ecofriendly and All-Natural," points out that the sales of organic food in the United States topped \$6.4 billion in 1999 with a projected annual increase of 20 percent. Manufacturers of clothes and fashion accessories, such as solar-powered watches, are cashing in on the trend. Maria Rodale, who helps direct a publishing empire covering "natural" products, founded the women's lifestyle magazine *Organic Style*. Rodale told the *Times* that women want to do the right thing for "the environment but not at the cost of living well." Advances in technology give personal items and household wares an all-natural eco-friendly look that is also the last word in fashion. Consumers "don't want to sacrifice anything," Ms. Rodale told a reporter. Why should there be a trade-off between a commitment to nature and a commitment to the good life? "Increasingly there are options that don't compromise on either front."

The food industry does not sell food any more than the fashion industry sells clothes or the automobile industry sells automobiles. They sell imagery. The slogan, "Everything the consumer wants with no trade-offs," covers all aspects of our dreamworld. Sex without zippers, children without zits, lawns without weeds, wars without casualties, and food without technology. Reality involves trade-offs and rather substantial ones. For this reason, if you tried to sell reality, your competitor would drive you out of business by avoiding factual claims and selling fantasy—whatever consumers believe in—instead. Consumers should not be confused or disillusioned by facts. They are encouraged to assume that they buy products of Nature or Creation. In view of this fantasy, how could consumers view genetic engineering with anything but suspicion?

Nature's Own Methods

Genetic engineering, with its stupendous capacity for increasing the efficiencies of food production in all

departments, including flavors and colorings, raises a problem. How can genetic recombination be presented to the consumer as completely natural—as part of nature's spontaneous course—as have other aspects of food technology? A clean label would tell consumers there is nothing unnatural or inauthentic about genetically engineered products. Industry has responded in


two complementary ways to this problem.

First, the food industry has resisted calls to label bio-engineered products. Gene Grabowski of the Grocery Manufacturers Association, for example, worries that labeling "would imply that there's something wrong with food, and there isn't." Michael J. Phillips, an economist with the Biotechnology Industry Organization, adds that labeling "would only confuse consumers by suggesting that the process of biotechnology might in and of itself have an impact on the safety of food. This is not the case."

Second, manufacturers point out that today's genetic technologies do not differ, except in being more precise, from industrial processes that result in the emulsifiers, stabilizers, enzymes, proteins, cultures, and other ingredients that do enjoy the benefits of a clean label. Virtually every plant consumed by human beings—canola, for example—is the product of so much breeding, hybridization, and modification that it hardly resembles its

wild ancestors. This is a good thing, too, since these wild ancestors were barely edible if not downright poisonous. Manufacturers argue that genetic engineering differs from conventional breeding only because it is more accurate and therefore changes nature less.

For example, Monsanto Corporation, in a recent full-page ad, pictures a bucolic landscape reminiscent of a painting by Constable. The headline reads, "FARMING: A picture of the Future." The ad then represents genetic engineering as all natural—or at least as natural as are conventional biotechnologies that have enabled humanity to engage successfully in agriculture. "The products of biotechnology will be based on nature's own methods," the ad assures the industry.



Engraving from Maria Sibylla Merian, *Erucarum Ortus, Alimentum et Paradoxa Metamorphosis* (Amsterdam 1718)

"Monsanto scientists are working with nature to develop innovative products for farmers of today, and of the future."

In this advertisement, Monsanto applies the tried-and-true formula to which the food industry has long been committed—presenting a technology as revolutionary, innovative, highly advanced, and as "based on nature's own methods." *Everything* is natural. Why not? As long as there are no distinctions, there are no trade-offs. Consumers can buy what they believe in. A thing is natural if the public believes it is. "There is something in this more than natural," as Hamlet once said, "if philosophy could find it out."

Four Concepts of the Natural

If consumers reject bioengineered food as "unnatural," what does this mean? In what way are foods that result from conventional methods of genetic mutation and selection, which have vastly altered crops and livestock, more "natural" than those that depend in some way on gene splicing? Indeed, is anything in an organic TV dinner "natural" other than, say, the rodent droppings that may be found in it? Since I am a

Why should anyone assume that a product that is "natural" is safer, more healthful, or more aesthetically or ethically attractive than one that is not?

philosopher, not a scientist, I am particularly interested in the moral, aesthetic, and cultural—as distinct from the chemical, biological, or physical—aspects of the natural world. I recognize that many of us depend in our moral, aesthetic, and spiritual lives on distinguishing those things for which humans are responsible from those that occur as part of nature's spontaneous course.

Philosophers have long pondered the question whether the concept of the natural can be used in a normative sense—that is, whether to say that a practice or a product is "natural" is somehow to imply that it is better to that extent than one that is not. Why should anyone assume that a product that is "natural" is safer, more healthful, or more aesthetically or ethically attractive than one that is not? And why is technology thought to be intrinsically risky when few of us would survive without quite a lot of it?

Among the philosophers who have questioned the "naturalistic fallacy"—the assumption that what is natural is for that reason good—the nineteenth-century British philosopher John Stuart Mill has been particularly influential. In his "Essay on Nature," Mill argues that the term "nature" can refer either to the totality of

things ("the sum of all phenomena, together with the causes which produce them") or to those phenomena that take place "without the agency... of man." Plainly, everything in the world—including every technology—is natural and belongs equally to nature in the first sense of the term. Mill comments:

To bid people to conform to the laws of nature when they have no power but what the laws of nature give them—when it is a physical impossibility for them to do the smallest thing otherwise than through some law of nature—is an absurdity. The thing they need to be told is, what particular law of nature they should make use of in a particular case.

Of nature in the second sense—that which takes place without the agency of man—Mill has a dour view. "Nearly all the things which men are hanged or imprisoned for doing to one another, are nature's every day performances," Mill wrote. Nature may have cared for us in the days of the Garden of Eden. In more recent years, however, humanity has had to alter Creation to survive. Mill concludes, "For while human action cannot help conforming to nature in one meaning of the term, the very aim and object of action is to alter and improve nature in the other meaning."

Following Mill, it is possible to distinguish four different conceptions of nature to understand the extent to which bioengineered food may or may not be natural. These four senses of the term include:

- 1) **Everything in the universe.** The significant opposite of the "natural" in this sense is the "supernatural." Everything technology produces has to be completely natural because it conforms to all of nature's laws and principles.
- 2) **Creation in the sense of what God has made.** The distinction here lies between what is sacred because of its pedigree (God's handiwork) and what is profane (what humans produce for pleasure or profit).
- 3) **That which is independent of human influence or contrivance.** The concept of "nature" or the "natural" in this sense, e.g., the "pristine," is understood as a privative notion defined in terms of the absence of the effects of human activity. The opposite of the "natural" in this sense is the "artificial."
- 4) **That which is authentic or true to itself.** The opposite of the "natural" in this sense is the specious, illusory, or superficial. The "natural" is trustworthy and honest, while the sophisticated, worldly, or contrived is deceptive and risky.

These four conceptions of nature are logically independent. To say that an item or a process—genetic engineering, for example—is "natural" because it obeys the laws of nature, is by no means to imply it is "natural" in any other sense. That genetically manipulated foods can be found within 1) the totality of phenomena does not show that they are "natural" in the sense that they are 2) part of primordial Creation; 3) free of human

**Graceful Simplicity: Toward a
Philosophy and Politics of
Simple Living**

Jerome M. Segal

In *Graceful Simplicity*, Jerome M. Segal expands and deepens the contemporary discourse on how to achieve a simpler, less harried way of life. He articulates a powerful conception of simple living—rooted in beauty, peace of mind, appreciativeness, and generosity of spirit. At the same time, he criticizes much of the “simple living movement” for believing that we can realize this conception as isolated individuals if only we free ourselves from overconsumption. Segal argues that, unfortunately, we have created a society in which human needs can be adequately met only at high levels of income. Instead of individual renunciation, he calls for a politics of simplicity that would put the facilitation of simple living at the heart of our approach to social and economic policy.

“Graceful Simplicity is a marvelously textured analysis of the elusive ideal of simple living. For those eager to find a way to get off the “more is better” treadmill, Jerome Segal offers insight and hope. Drawing upon philosophy, history, economics, sociology, and psychology, he explains why simplicity is not a simple concept and reveals why it retains its perennial allure. A must read.”

—David Shi, president of Furman University and
author of *The Simple Life: Plain Living and High
Thinking in American Culture*

*“In simple, graceful prose, Jerome Segal explains why
less elaborate modes of living would make us happier.”*

—Robert H. Frank, Cornell University,
author of *Luxury Fever*

263 pages
\$26.00 (cloth)

Henry Holt and Company LLC.
Available at bookstores or directly
from the publisher:
Tel.: 888.330.8477
FAX: 800.672.2054

To request examination copies
or inquire about classroom use, write to
academic@hholt.com

contrivance; or 4) authentic and expressive of the virtues of rustic or peasant life.

The problem of consumer acceptance of biotechnology arises in part because the food industry sells its products as natural in the last three senses. The industry wishes to be regulated, however, only in the context of the first conception of nature, which does not distinguish among phenomena on the basis of their histories, sources, or provenance. The industry argues that only the biochemical properties of its products should matter to regulation; the process (including genetic engineering) is irrelevant to food safety and should not be considered.

The food industry downplays the biochemical properties of its products, however, when it advertises them to consumers. The industry—at least if the approach taken by General Mills is typical—tries to give the consumer whatever he believes in. If the consumer believes in a process by which rugged farmers on the slopes of the Cascades raise organic TV dinners


*The food industry downplays the biochemical
properties of its products . . . when it advertises
them to consumers. The industry . . . tries to
give the consumer whatever he believes in.*

from the soil by sheer force of personality, so be it. You will see the farm pictured on the package to suggest the product is close to Creation, free of contrivance, and authentic or expressive of rural virtues. What you will not see on any label—if the industry has its way—is a reference to genetic engineering. The industry believes regulators should concern themselves only with the first concept of nature—the scientific concept—and thus with the properties of the product. Concepts related to the process are used to evoke images that “give consumers what they want with no trade-offs.”

Shakespeare on Biotechnology

I confess that, as a consumer, I find organic foods appealing and I insist on “all-natural” ingredients. Am I just foolish? You might think that I would see through labels like “all natural” and “organic”—not to mention “whole” foods—and that I would reject them as marketing ploys of a cynical industry. Yet like many consumers, I want to believe that the “natural” is somewhat better than the artificial. Is this just a fallacy?

Although I am a professional philosopher (or perhaps because of this), I would not look first to the literature of philosophy to understand what may be an irrational—or at least an unscientific—commitment to



*The New Yorker Collection, 1999,
Peter Steiner from cartoonbank.com.
All Rights Reserved.*

buying "all natural" products. My instinct would be to look in Shakespeare to understand what may be contradictory attitudes or inexplicable sentiments.

Shakespeare provides his most extensive discussion of biotechnology in *The Winter's Tale*, one of his comedies. In Act IV, Polixenes, King of Bohemia, disguises himself to spy upon his son, Florizel, who has fallen in love with Perdita, whom all believe to be a shepherd's daughter. In fact, though raised as a shepherdess, Perdita is the castaway daughter of the King of Sicily, a close but now estranged friend of Polixenes. Perdita welcomes the disguised Polixenes and an attendant lord to a sheep shearing feast in late autumn, offering them dried flowers "that keep/ Seeming and savour all winter long." Polixenes merrily chides her: "well you fit our ages/ With flowers of winter."

She replies that only man-made hybrids flourish so late in the fall:

... carnations, and streak'd gillyvors,
Which some call nature's bastards. Of that kind
Our rustic garden's barren; and I care not
To get slips of them.

Polixenes asks why she rejects cold-hardy flowers such as gillyvors, a dianthus. She answers that they come from human contrivance, not from "great creat-

ing nature." She complains there is "art" in their "piedness," or variegation. Polixenes replies: "Say there be;

Yet nature is made better by no mean
But nature makes that mean; so over that art
Which you say adds to nature, is an art
That nature makes. . . . This is an art
Which does mend nature—change it rather; but
The art itself is nature.

The statement, "The art itself is nature" anticipates the claim made by Monsanto that "The products of biotechnology will be based on nature's own methods." Polixenes, Mill, and Monsanto remind us that everything in the universe conforms to nature's own principles, and relies wholly on nature's powers. From a scientific perspective, in other words, all nature is one. The mechanism of a lever, for example, may occur in the physiology of a wild animal or in the structure of a machine. Either way, it is natural. One might be forced to agree, then, that genetic engineering applies nature's own methods and principles; in other words, "the art itself is nature."

The exchange between Perdita and Polixenes weaves together the four conceptions of nature I identified earlier in relation to John Stuart Mill. When Polixenes states, "The art itself is nature," he uses the term "nature" to comprise everything in the

Universe, that is, everything that conforms to physical law. Second, Perdita refers to "great creating nature," that is, to Creation, i.e., the primordial origin and condition of life before the advent of human society. Third, she contrasts nature to art or artifice by complaining that hybrids do not arise spontaneously but show "art" in their "piedness." Finally, Perdita refers to her "rustic garden," which, albeit cultivated, is "natural" in the sense of simple or unadorned, in contrast to the ornate horticulture that would grace a royal garden. The comparison between the court and the country correlates, of course, with the division that exists in Perdita herself—royal in carriage and character by her birth, yet possessed of rural virtues by her upbringing.

Shakespeare elaborates this last conception of "nature" as the banter continues between Perdita and the disguised Polixenes. To his assertion, "The art itself is nature," Perdita concedes, "So it is." Polixenes then drives home his point: "Then make your garden rich in gillyvors,/ And do not call them bastards."

To which Perdita responds:

I'll not put
The dibble in earth to set one slip of them;
No more than were I painted I would wish
This youth should say 'twere well, and only therefore
Desire to breed by me.

Besides comparing herself to breeding stock—amusing in the context, since she speaks to her future father-in-law in the presence of his son—Perdita reiterates a fourth and crucial sense of the "natural." In this sense, what is "natural" is true to itself; it is honest, authentic, and genuine. This conception reflects

*From a scientific perspective . . . all nature is one.
The mechanism of a lever . . . may occur in the
physiology of a wild animal or in the structure
of a machine. Either way, it is natural.*

Aristotle's theory of the "nature" of things, which refers to qualities that are spontaneous because they are inherent or innate.

Perdita stands by her insistence on natural products—from flowers she raises to cosmetics she uses—in spite of Polixenes' cynical but scientific reproofs. Does this suggest Perdita is merely a good candidate for Ms. Rodale's organic chic? Should she receive a free introductory copy of *Organic Style*? Certainly not. There is something about Perdita's rejection of biotechnology that withstands this sort of criticism. Why have Perdita's actions a moral authority or authenticity that the choices consumers make today may lack?

Having It Both Ways

Perdita possesses moral authority because she is willing to live with the consequences of her convictions and of the distinctions on which they are based. By refusing to paint herself to appear more attractive, for example, Perdita contrasts her qualities, which are innate, to those of the "streak'd gillyvor," which owe themselves to technological meddling. This comparison effectively gives her the last word because she suits the action to it: she does not and would not paint herself to attract a lover. Similarly, Perdita does not raise hybrids, though she admits, "I would I had some flow'rs" that might become the "time of day" of the youthful guests at the feast, such as Florizel.

Perdita does not try to have it both ways—to reject hybrids but also to grow cold-hardy flowers. She

*Today's consumers insist . . . on the local, the
native, the spontaneous. Yet . . . they are
unwilling to live with the consequences of
their principles or preferences.*

ridicules those who match lofty ideals with ordinary actions—whose practice belies their professed principles. For example, Camillo, the Sicilian lord who attends Polixenes, compliments Perdita on her beauty. He says, "I should leave grazing, were I of your flock,/ And only live by gazing." She laughs at him and smartly replies, "You'd be so lean that blasts of January/ Would blow you through and through."

Many people today share Perdita's affection for nature and her distaste for technology. Indeed, it is commonplace to celebrate Nature's spontaneous course and to condemn the fabrications of biotechnology. Jeremy Rifkin speaks of "Playing Ecological Roulette with Mother Nature's Designs;" Ralph Nader has written the foreword to a book titled, *Genetically Engineered Food: Changing the Nature of Nature*. The Prince of Wales, in a tirade against biotechnology, said, "I have always believed that agriculture should proceed in harmony with nature, recognising that there are natural limits to our ambitions. We need to rediscover a reverence for the natural world to become more aware of the relationship between God, man, and creation."

While consumers today share Perdita's preference for the natural in the sense of the authentic and unadorned and spurn technological meddling, they do not share her willingness to live with the consequences of their commitment. They expect to enjoy year round fruits and vegetables of unblemished appearance, and consistent taste and nutritional quality. Gardeners wish to plant lawns and yards with species that are native and indigenous, and they support commissions

and fund campaigns to throw back the "invasions" of exotic and alien species. Yet they also want lawns that resist drought, blight, and weeds, and—to quote Perdita again—to enjoy flowers that "come before the swallow dares, and take/The winds of March with beauty." In other words, the consumer wants it both ways. Today's consumers, as Ms. Rodale knows, "don't want to sacrifice anything." Today's consumers insist, as did Perdita, on the local, the native, the spontaneous. Yet they lack her moral authority because they are unwilling to live with the consequences of their principles or preferences. Consumers today refuse to compromise; they expect fruits and flowers that survive "the birth/ Of trembling winter" and are plentiful and perfect all year round.

Naked Lunch

Those who defend genetic engineering in agriculture are likely to regard as irrational consumer concerns about the safety of genetically manipulated crops. The oil and other products of Roundup Ready soybeans, according to this position, pose no more risks to the consumer than do products from conventional soybeans. Indeed, soybean oil, *qua* oil, contains neither DNA nor protein and so will be the same whether or not the roots of the plant are herbicide resistant. Even when protein or DNA differs, no clear argument can be given to suppose that this difference—e.g., the order of a few nucleotides—involves any danger. Crops are the outcome of centuries or millennia of genetic crossing, selection, mutation, breeding, and so on. Genetic engineering adds but a wrinkle to the vast mountains of technology that separate the foods we eat from wild plants and animals.

The same kind of argument may undermine consumer beliefs that "natural" colors and flavors are safer or more edible than artificial ones. In fact, chemical compounds that provide "natural" and "artificial" flavors can be identical and may be manufactured at the same factories. The difference may lie only in the processes by which they are produced or derived. An almond flavor that is produced artificially, as I have mentioned, may be purer and therefore safer than one extracted from peach or apricot pits. Distinctions between the natural and the artificial, then, need not correspond with differences in safety, quality, or taste—at least from the perspective of science.

Distinctions consumers draw between the natural and the artificial—and preferences for the organic over the engineered—reflect differences that remain important nonetheless to our cultural, social, and aesthetic lives. We owe nature a respect that we do not owe technology. The rise of objective, neutral, physical and chemical science invites us, however, to disregard all such moral, aesthetic, and cultural distinctions and act

The New Progressive Era: Toward a Fair and Deliberative Democracy

Peter Levine

A century ago, Americans embarked on a period of civic renewal and political reform. Today, amid deep dissatisfaction with our major institutions, there are signs that a new movement may revive the spirit of the original Progressive Era. Peter Levine draws inspiration from the great Progressive leader Robert M. LaFollette, Sr., and his circle, which included John Dewey, Jane Addams, and Louis Brandeis. He discusses the shortcomings of this group as well as their successes, but he argues that their ideal of a fair and deliberative democracy is right for our time. Bringing their Progressive philosophy to bear on contemporary concerns, Levine advocates campaign finance reform, an entirely different approach to regulation, new styles of journalism and civic education, and fundamental changes in the tax system. Combining philosophical arguments, historical background, empirical data, and concrete proposals, *The New Progressive Era* offers today's most comprehensive plan for civic renewal and political reform.

"Peter Levine's new book represents an important new voice in our national deliberations about how to revitalize American democracy. It is a thorough, thoughtful account of the contemporary relevance of the ideas and innovations of the Progressive Era and a persuasive case for a new progressive agenda in American politics."

—Robert D. Putnam, Kennedy School of Government,
Harvard University

"Some books you read and put aside. Others you send to friends; this is one of those books. Peter Levine brings a rich historical and philosophical perspective to an immediate and practical question: What is going to be the effect of all the effort that has gone into civic renewal in the last decade? This book speaks to everyone from journalists to foundation executives to teachers to members of civic organizations—all citizens. Don't miss reading it."

—David Mathews, President, Kettering Foundation

272 pages; \$65.00 (cloth)
\$19.95 (paper)

Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
<http://www.rowmanlittlefield.com>
Tel.: 800.462.6420; FAX: 800.338.4550
For examination copies, please call
800.273.5720

only on facts that can be scientifically analyzed and proven. Indeed, the food industry, when it is speaking to regulators rather than advertising to consumers, insists on this rational, objective approach.

In an essay titled, "Environments at Risk," Mary Douglas characterizes the allure of objective, rational, value-neutral, science:

This is the invitation to full self-consciousness that is offered in our time. We must accept it. But we should do so knowing that the price is William Burroughs' *Naked Lunch*. The day when everyone can see exactly what it is on the end of everyone's fork, on that day there is no pollution and no purity and nothing edible or inedible, credible or incredible, because the classifications of social life are gone. There is no more meaning.

Advances in genetic engineering invite us to the full self-consciousness that Douglas describes and aptly analogizes to the prison life depicted in *Naked Lunch*. It is the classifications of social life—not those of biological science—that clothe food and everything else with meaning. Genetic engineering poses a problem principally because it crosses moral, aesthetic, or cultural—not biological—boundaries. The fact that the technology exists and is successful shows, indeed, that the relevant biological boundaries (i.e., between species) that might have held in the past now no longer exist.

Given advances in science and technology, how can we maintain the classifications of social life—for example, distinctions between natural and artificial flavors and between organic and engineered ingredients? How may we, like Perdita, respect the difference between the products of "great creating nature" and those of human contrivance? Perdita honors this distinction by living with its consequences. Her severest test comes when Polixenes removes his disguise and threatens to condemn her to death if she ever sees Florizel again. Florizel asks her to elope, but she resigns herself to the accident of their origins—his high, hers (she believes) low—that separates them forever. Dressed up as a queen for the festivities, Perdita tells Florizel: "I will queen it no further. Leave me, sir; I will go milk my ewes and weep."

Perdita, of course, both renounced her cake and ate it, too. In Act IV, she gives up Florizel and his kingdom, but in Act V she gets them. Her true identity as a princess is eventually discovered, and so the marriage happily takes place. If you or I tried to live as fully by our beliefs and convictions—if we insisted on eating only those foods that come from great creating nature rather than from industry—we would not be so fortunate. "You'd be so lean that blasts of January / Would blow you through and through."

Perdita is protected by a playwright who places her in a comedy. Shakespeare allows her to live up to her convictions without compromising her lifestyle. This is exactly what the food industry promises to do—"to

give consumers what they want with no trade-offs." It is exactly what Ms. Rodale offers—to protect the environment "but not at the cost of living well." The food, fashion, and other industries work off stage to arrange matters so that consumers can renounce genetic engineering, artificial flavors, industrial agriculture, and multinational corporations. At the same time, consumers can enjoy an inexpensive, all-natural, organic, TV dinner from Creation via Cascadian Farms.

Perdita lives in the moral order of a comedy. In that moral order, no compromises and no trade-offs are necessary. You and I are not so fortunately situated. Indeed, we must acknowledge the tragic aspect of life—the truth that good things are often not compatible and that we have to trade off one for the sake of obtaining the other. The food industry, by suggesting that we can have everything we believe in, keeps us from recognizing that tragic truth. The industry makes all the compromises and hides them from the consumer.

Mark Sagoff
Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy
School of Public Affairs
University of Maryland
ms2@umail.umd.edu

This article is based on a presentation made at the National Agricultural Biotechnology Council's annual meeting, "High Anxiety and Biotechnology: Who's Buying, Who's Not, and Why?," held May 22-24, 2001. A version of this article is forthcoming in NABC Report 13 symposium proceedings.

The author acknowledges the support of the National Human Genome Research Institute program on Ethical, Legal, and Social Implications of Human Genetics, Grant R01HG02363; also the National Science Foundation, Grant 9729295.

Sources: *Food Processing*, February 1988. Lucy Saunders, "Selecting an Enzyme," *Food Product Design* (May 1995), on-line at: <http://www.foodproductdesign.com/archive/1995/0595AP.html>; Michael Pollan, "Behind the Organic-Industrial Complex," *New York Times Magazine* (May 13, 2001); Ruth La Ferla, "Fashionistas, Ecofriendly and All-Natural," *New York Times* (July 15, 2001); Bill Lambrecht, "Up To 50%+ of Crops Now Genetically Modified," *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, Washington Bureau (August 22, 1999), and available on-line at <http://www.healthresearchbooks.com/articles/labels2.htm>; Jim Wilson, "Scientific Food Fight," in *Popular Mechanics* on-line, which is available at <http://popularmechanics.com/popmech/sci/0002STRSM.html>; John Stuart Mill, "Nature" in *Three Essays on Religion* (New York, Greenwood Press, 1969), reprint of the 1874 ed.; Jeremy Rifkin, "The Biotech Century: Playing Ecological Roulette with Mother Nature's Designs," in *E Magazine* (May/June 1998); Martin Teitel and Kimberly A. Wilson, *Genetically Engineered Food: Changing the Nature of Nature: What You Need to Know to Protect Yourself, Your Family, and Our Planet* (Vermont: Inner Traditions, Int'l, Ltd., 1999); "Seeds of Disaster: An Article by The Prince of Wales," *Daily Telegraph* (June 8, 1998); Mary Douglas, "Environments at Risk," in *Implicit Meanings: Essays in Anthropology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975).