# Food Safety

The expectation about food safety is that it begins with you. The rest of these food safety organizations are just here to remind us about the relevance of staying safe and healthy. The reason we do not know about crucial resources is ignorance. Everyone out there is capable of understanding what is right and wrong, but no one chooses to pay attention. The only way that we get to learn essential matters in healthy lives is when something unhealthy and extremely terrible happens to one of us or someone close to us. Leakers play an insignificant role since even if you convince people that particular food or cosmetic is awful, they will only avoid it for a while. The overall assessments made are food safety is an individual responsibility.

 When it comes to the safety of food, there is undoubtedly no second guessing. All health institutions have stringent rules and regulations that are aimed at ensuring that the right amount, type, and quality of food has been taken by society (Byrd-Bredbenner et al. 4061). It is as a result of this that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have decided to enlighten the public about the benefits of preventing oneself from contracting health complications that are related to consuming lousy food. It is worth noting that food poisoning is one of the most rampant causes of common causes such as stomach upsets and salmonellosis just to mention a few (Dewaal 928). The good thing about the CDCs is that they take their own time to educate, caution, and even guide the public about some of the most fundamental food safety acts (CDC n.p).

 Ideally, keep in mind the fact that there are several food businesses out there which are out to bag profits rather than serve the people with useful commodities. Such firms or organizations are usually at a likelihood of intentionally providing customers with false information regarding the quality of the food being vented. Due to this, innocent consumers end up being exposed to deadly health complications that arise from taking in haphazard food substances (Dewaal 928). Food health and safety is a sensitive matter that when poorly handled can cause massive loss of lives (Dewaal 924). It is reported that “consumers take food safety precautions only when they perceive a risk such as when they handle raw poultry, fear they may give others food poisoning or when others are watching” (Byrd-Bredbenner et al. 4071). This shows that while organizations such as CDC expect consumers to be at the forefront in ensuring food security, most consumers ignore the safety of how and what they eat. The positive value of these CDCs is that the reliability of their information cannot be doubted.

 The safety of the public is the responsibility of the state just as it is that of an individual. There are several accredited and reliable health organizations that will stop at nothing to monitor, inspect, and assure the safety of the public. An excellent example of this is the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH). Its objective is to oversee all health activities beginning with registrations documents and processes of newly born babies, records for immunization, outbreaks of diseases as well as inspecting all fields of life revolving around the matter of food safety. The most significant role played by the DOHMH is that routine inspections are conducted in all food outlets and joints for vending food with the hope of grading them on a particular score of the level of cleanliness (NYC Health n.p). If a hotel aces this test, the grade hikes and this is how other potential customers get to learn about it (NYC Health n.p).

 On the same note, it has been brought to light that the more a restaurant receives these constant positive praises from the DOHMH, the higher it is for it to increase its general level of productivity. It is the objective of most businesses to want to improve their economies of scale but, what it takes to get to that point is what helps to define the commitment of the firm. In this case, it is crucial that this organization conduct these cleanliness evaluations once or twice a year as this creates the impression that even when the other moments of the years are characterized by poor quality foods, at least businesses abide by the laws during all inspections.

 At the mention of the Food and Drug Administration, the first thing that comes to mind is how strict they are when it comes to labels and provision of information regarding food consumption and safety. Such information must be provided as it is “necessary in order to verify counterfeit, authenticity, and provenance of food in the event of fraud of commercial disputes” (Aung and Chang 180). It is the goal of the FDA to ensure that even if there is a new food that everybody seems to like, the public should be well aware of whatever it is it is getting itself into in any point in life (FDA n.p). Ideally, this organization has obliged most firms and food manufacturers to adhere to its codes of ethics by not only producing healthy and safe food but also exposing the society to the right type of data when it comes to the consumption of different kinds of food (FDA n.p). Furthermore, despite the fact that FDA has a weak regulatory structure that cannot pin down those who violate laws regarding safe food, it “is responsible for regulating and inspecting about eighty percent of the U.S. food supply, including many imported foods, using this startlingly weak statutory structure” (Dewaal 923). There is no exception regarding the quality and reliability of the provision of any food, drug and even cosmetic to the public, but many who violate the law get away due to FDA’s limited ability to inspect such products (Dewaal 923).

 In a whole new perspective, note that the FDA works hand in hand with the United States Department of Agriculture to ensure that no businesses lose their legality due to subjecting the public to wrong pieces of information about their specific commodities. Intentionally misleading customers could be regarded as a severe federal crime which might not access bail easily. In this case, the FDA takes upon its obligation to enlighten the public about the importance of fully understanding the contents of a specified commodity before necessarily using it (Dewaal 927). Moreover, “Information should be presented in a manner that informs and educates the public without causing unnecessary fear or alarm” (Dewaal 927 - 928). Keep in mind that when an organization is found guilty of such crimes, the chances of being locked down tend entirely to run so high. To avoid such conflicts with the law, most producers are asked to ascertain that the safety of the food, drugs, and other commodities that they produce is at its optimum range.

 In yet another perspective, genetically manufactured commodities have become the order of the day even though reliable scientific sources of information reveal that their continued use could result in dangerous health conditions (Strom n.p). In as much as GMOs have the capability of saving a lot of people from the challenge of hunger, it should be understood that they come with significant setbacks as well. Think about the fact that even in normal conditions, GMOs tend to grow bad faster than the typical food creating the impression that even after consuming, there is no ruling out the idea that the food could be already going bad within the body (Strom n.p). The worst thing is that once they go wrong, toxic chemicals are released into the body.

 The FDA has issued a stern warning against misinformation such as telling customers that an individual commodity is not genetically modified yet in the real case, its makeup has been altered genetically (Strom n.p). When such kind of crimes are interpreted from a legal perspective, what is clear is that if the defendant is found guilty of the misguiding customer, the jail term is not the only thing that he will be facing (FDA n.p). In other words, labelling a common commodity as GMO also amounts top equal charges which give the notion that whichever way that you choose to inform the consumer about the goods and services, sticking to the truth at all times is everything that matters (Bovay and Julian 7). Ideally, advertisers and marketing firms have been warned against doing ads and promoting goods and services for the sheer sake of making profits.

 On the note of genetically engineered food, understand that the National Bioengineered Food Disclosure Standard (NBFDS) requires that all manufacturing firms especially those interested with GMOs to fully bring to light all the activities, plans, and processes of distribution that they use to make ends meet (Bovay and Julian 2). This is further supported by Aung and Chang who indicate that “monitoring and surveillance for high-value and high-risk food is important and inspection should be done at the port of entry, the best place to control food safety for imported products” (178). If this is done, most producers get the feeling that even if they were to come up with something that is easy and cheap to afford and access, there are still specific standards that have to be met according to the rules of the NBFDS. The right thing about this organization is that it has eased the pain of accounting for misinformation from one producer to the other as it has taken the liberty of conducting the evaluation process all by itself.

 When asked about the reason for this obligation, the NBFDS was fast to respond stating that all customers have the right and freedom to make a choice about what they want to consume, apply or even plant. The freedom to choose whether an individual is interested in GMOs or non-GMOs is the sole decision of the consumer and not the producer as it seemed before (Byrd-Bredbenner et al. 4073). Back in the days when GMOs overtook the natural foods, the producers paid no attention to the needs, preferences and tastes of clients but rather the profits at the end of the day. To this point in the study, what has successfully been established is that providing misguiding information to consumers is more or less like denying them their fundamental right and freedom.
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