



Natural vs. Regulated

June 24, 2024

“I don’t need metabolically unhealthy politicians and obese bureaucrats watching out for my health,” *The Telegraph* [quotes](#) an anonymous source.

The subject? “How milk became the new culture war dividing America,” published on June 22. It’s a “natural” vs. “technological” debate.

“For more than 130 years, Americans have been instructed that drinking milk that comes directly from a cow’s udder can be dangerous,” Tony Diver’s article begins, but how it ends is telling: “‘With respect to the question of food being natural—arsenic is natural,’ Prof Schaffner said.” And so, too, he says, is cyanide.

“Sharks are natural. Those things can all kill you. So just because something is natural does not mean that it’s safe.”

That sounds like something I’d say.

But is it something to say about raw milk?

Consider the historical context. Raw milk and its products have been produced for human consumption for millennia. Of course there are dangers, and pasteurization has done wonders to curb bacteriological infections and death. Still, a lot of people wonder what we’ve lost in the pasteurization process. Nutrition and immune system health, for example. So for decades—perhaps as long as there have been regulations to make pasteurization mandatory—there’s been a “pro-natural” backlash.

On the Nature side, we note that our populations aren’t as healthy as you’d expect from the benevolent tyranny of politicians, regulators, and, uh, “obese bureaucrats.”

So, last week, “the latest bill to repeal an outright ban on raw milk hit the governor’s desk in Louisiana, after similar efforts in West Virginia, Iowa, Georgia and North Dakota.”

If signed into law, Louisianans will be able to purchase raw milk in stores—“albeit with a warning, in capital letters, that it is ‘not for human consumption.’

“Everyone, including the legislators, knows that instruction will be ignored.”

There’s something sickness-inducing about that.

This is Common Sense. I’m Paul Jacob.