

[sci.bio.food–science] Additions and Changes to FAQ, and New User Info

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.answers/2004–07/0023.html>

From: Paul King (*pking123_at_sympatico.ca*)

Date: 07/28/04

Date: 28 Jul 2004 04:15:50 GMT

Archive–Name: sci/food–science–faq/diff

Posting–Frequency: biweekly

Last–modified: 2004/05/02

RECENT CHANGES (2 May 2004):

There are some changes that will be made to the FAQ over the coming weeks. So, watch out for changes to other parts, notably 3/3.

Paul King,
SBFS Maintainer

The following addition was made to the section below, called "INFORMATION FOR NEW USERS":

NOTES ON 'NETTIQUETTE':

Please read also FAQ 1/3, Part I: GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR POSTING IN SCI.BIO.FOOD–SCIENCE

There has been a slow but sure trend in recent years for some posters to get emotional or to bait emotional debates with their postings. This is never a good thing, since discussions most commonly deteriorate into name–calling and so on. Others wonder why their posts hardly get any responses from this group. All this is discussed here.

Emotional debates are common in any topic for which adherents hold passionate, but opposing, beliefs. One of life's many paradoxes holds that if you shout, you will not be heard. Keep your conversations polite and cordial. The basis of politeness means that you must realise that this is a text medium, and people cannot see your body language to find out what you intend with these words, and as a result most people tend to assume the worst.

You have to be extra careful in how you word things with others.

However, there are many other reasons your postings do not get desirable responses. First of all, realise that this is a food science newsgroup, and that most of the posters tend to toe the party line of science. If you find this hard to take, there are many other newsgroups that you might find more friendly. In FAQ 1/3, for example, the newsgroup has many explicitly–stated goals, along with a newsgroup charter. These were agreed to and voted on over 10 years ago. Charters and statements of goals are a fact of life of all newsgroups under the sci.* hierarchy, and other hierarchies as well.

While we welcome posts from anybody and everybody, you must ensure that your postings are on–topic. Some newsgroups dealing with other aspects of foods which we don't deal with:

sci.med.nutrition rec.food.preserving rec.food.cooking
rec.food.recipes alt.food.wine alt.food.fat–free
rec.food–veg rec.food.veg.cooking alt.support.diet
alt.food.vegan alt.food.vegan.science
alt.animals.ethics.vegetarian alt.sport.weightlifting.vegetarian
alt.support.diet.* (there are several newsgroups in this hierarchy)

If you wonder why your posting garners few or no responses, it could be due to several reasons, including: 1) Nobody understood your post; 2) your post was not on–topic for the newsgroup, 3) your post showed an obvious intent at baiting an argument, and people properly ignored it, or 4) your post perhaps gave nothing for others to respond to.

The following changes/additions have been made to FAQ 2/3 – Definitions:

Adulteration

The addition or contamination of a food by a substance foreign to the normal product, which debases it or disguises inferior quality. See Unadulterated.

Botulinum Cook

The heat treatment given to a low acid canned food (having a pH higher than 4.2) sufficient to inactivate 10¹² spores of *Clostridium botulinum*. This heat treatment is called the Fo value and it is equivalent to a process of 3 mins at 121°C, 10 mins at 115°C or 32 mins at 110°C.

Controlled atmosphere packaging

A procedure whereby residual air in a food pack is replaced by a gas such as nitrogen or carbon dioxide, in order to minimise deteriorative changes on storage. An example is the packaging of peanuts in an atmosphere of nitrogen to inhibit rancidity.

Where food has been packed in this way in order to increase shelf life, the Food Labelling Regulations 1996 require the statement 'packaged in a protective atmosphere' to appear on the label.

Dairy-free (Non-dairy)

A description that may be applied to a food that is free from milk products and also from milk derivatives such as lactose, caseinate and whey powder.

Flavour/flavoured

The term 'flavour' may have reference to sensory quality of a food as perceived by a combination of smell and taste. Alternatively, 'flavour', for which the legally correct term is 'flavouring', is defined in the Flavouring in Food Regulations 1992 as a material used to impart odour, taste or both to a food. Under the UK Food Labelling Regulations 1996, if the declared flavour of a product is derived wholly or mainly from the named food, the product name is (for example) "Strawberry X". If it does not derive wholly or mainly from the named food, the product name is "Strawberry Flavour X".

The UK Food Standards Committee's 2nd Report on Food Labelling suggested that consumers do not appreciate the difference between 'flavour', which the FSC equated with artificial flavouring and 'flavoured' which they equated with the use of the real food to provide flavouring.

The UK Food Advisory Committee (FAC), in its 1990 Report on Labelling, decided that the difference between 'flavour' and 'flavoured' was significant and that since consumers were said to have difficulty distinguishing between the two, 'flavour' should be banned and replaced by 'taste'.

The supposed confusion between the two words is a misconception. Contrary to paragraph 64 of the FAC Report, the then Food Labelling Regulations 1984 as amended, and the current UK Food Labelling Regulations 1996, make no provision for the use of the term 'flavoured'. As indicated above those Regulations provide for (e.g.) 'Strawberry X' or 'Strawberry Flavour X' but no intermediate designation such as 'strawberry flavoured X'.

The only legal use of "flavoured" is in the Cocoa and Chocolate Products Regulations 1976. In those Regulations, cocoa products and non-filled chocolates may be described as 'Y flavoured chocolate', as the case may be, if the flavour is derived wholly or mainly from Y.

The term 'flavour' serves a useful and well-established purpose. The FAC suggestion to prohibit it and substitute 'taste' (reiterated in September 1994) is scientifically inaccurate and,

if it were to be embodied in legislation, would create instead of removing confusion.

Food

In the UK Food Safety Act 1990, 'food' is defined as including (a) drink; (b) articles and substances of no nutritional value which are used for human consumption; (c) chewing gum and other products of a like nature and use; and (d) articles and substances used as ingredients in the preparation of food or anything falling within this subsection. It does not include (a) live animals or birds, or live fish which are not used for human consumption while they are alive; (b) fodder or feeding stuffs for animals, birds or fish; (c) controlled drugs within the meaning of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971; and (d) subject to certain exceptions, medicinal products in respect of which product licences or marketing authorisations are in force. This definition states what 'food' includes and excludes (similarly to the latter part of the Codex definition) but it is deficient in failing to define what food is, i.e. does not specify "intended for human consumption".

The Codex Alimentarius defines 'food' as "any substance, whether processed, semi processed or raw, which is intended for human consumption and includes drink, chewing gum and any substance which has been used in the manufacture, preparation or treatment of food, but does not include cosmetics or tobacco or substances only used as drugs".

The EU Commission, in its November 2000 Proposal for a Regulation laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Authority, and laying down procedures in matters of food, proposed the following definition:

'Food' (or 'foodstuff') means any substance or product, whether processed, partially processed or unprocessed, intended to be, or expected to be ingested by humans. It includes drink, chewing gum and any substance intentionally incorporated into the food during its manufacture, preparation or treatment. It includes water, without prejudice to the requirements of Directives 80/778/EEC and 98/83/EC. It shall not include:

- (a) feed;
- (b) live animals unless they are prepared, packaged and/or served for human consumption;
- (c) plants prior to harvesting;
- (d) medicinal products within the meaning of Council Directive 65/65/EEC 17;
- (e) cosmetics within the meaning of Council Directive 76/768/EEC 18 ;
- (f) tobacco and tobacco products within the meaning of Council Directive 89/622/EEC 19 ;
- (g) narcotic or psychotropic substances within the meaning of the United Nations Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961 and the United Nations Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971.

Genetic modification

The process of making changes to the genes of an organism (whether an animal or plant organism or a microorganism). Genetic changes occur spontaneously in nature over a long period of time, but they may be produced intentionally either by traditional methods of selective breeding of animals and plants, or by modern methods of removal or insertion of genes. The latter method involves four basic steps;

1. the DNA of a cell of the donor organism is broken down and the pieces separated;
2. the desired gene is selected;
3. that gene is copied many times; and
4. nth generation laboratory copies (not the donor's original genes) are then inserted into the DNA of the receiver organism.

'Within–species' genetic modification is essentially similar to traditional breeding methods (except that it is much speedier and much less haphazard). Through 'trans–species' modification, results are obtainable that could not be obtained by traditional breeding methods. In relation to food, the potential scientific benefits of genetic modification are:

- * Improved agricultural performance (yields) with reduced use of pesticides
- * Ability to grow crops in inhospitable environments (e.g. via increased ability of plants to grow in conditions of drought, salinity and extremes of temperature
- * Delayed ripening, permitting improvements in quality and processing advantages.
- * Altered sensory attributes of food (e.g. flavour, texture, etc.) *
- Improved nutritional attributes e.g. combatting anti–nutritive and allergenic factors, and increased Vitamin A content in rice.
- * Improved processing characteristics leading to reduced waste and lower food costs to the consumer.

Some forms of trans–species modification may give rise to ethical and religious issues.

See also FAQ in section V (including within–species and trans–species) Part 2, Q 7, 8, and 9

HACCP

Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) is a preventive system of food control. It involves

1. Hazard analysis – examining and analysing every stage of a food–related operation to identify and assess hazards (q.v., below);
2. determining the 'critical control points' (q.v., above) at

- which action is required to control the identified hazards;
3. establishing the critical limits that must be met at each critical control point;
 4. establishing monitoring procedures;
 5. establishing corrective procedures when a deviation is identified by monitoring;
 6. establishing verification procedures to demonstrate that it is working correctly.
 7. Establishing record–keeping and documentation.

A few authoritative sources of information are:

- * "HACCP Systems and Guidelines" , CODEX Alimentarius, 1997.
- * Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point Principles and Application Guidelines, (US) National Advisory Committee on Microbiological Safety of Foods, 14 August 1997
<http://www.fst.vt.edu/haccp97/>
- * Food Safety and Inspection Service, US Department of Agriculture, Pathogen Reduction/HACCP & HACCP Implementation
<http://www.fsis.usda.gov/OA/haccp/imphaccp.htm>
- * Canadian Food Inspection Agency 's Food Safety Enhancement Program Web page of links at
<http://www.cfia-acia.agr.ca/english/ppc/haccp/haccp.html>
- * A Simple Guide to Understanding and Applying the Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point Concept. ILSI Europe, 1997.
<http://www.ilsi.org/pubs/ilsihace.pdf>

Isotonic

A term applied to a liquid product, e.g. a drink, having osmotic properties approximating to those of blood serum, i.e. 280 milli–osmoles per kg. However, the EU Scientific Committee for Food's February 2001 Report on Sports Drinks
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/sc/scf/out64_en.pdf includes

"It has become common to refer to carbohydrate–electrolyte sports drinks as isotonic drinks, as though the tonicity was their most important characteristic. The osmolality of ingested fluids is important as this can influence both the rates of gastric emptying and of intestinal water flux: both of these processes together will determine the effectiveness of rehydration fluids at delivering water for rehydration. An increasing osmolality of the gastric contents will tend to delay emptying, and increasing the carbohydrate or electrolyte content of sports drinks will generally result in an increased osmolality. The composition of the drinks and the nature of the solutes is, however, of greater importance than the osmolality itself....."

and concludes:

"Although most of the popular sports drinks are formulated to have as close to that of body fluids [102] and are promoted as isotonic drinks, there is good evidence that hypotonic solutions are more effective when rapid rehydration is desired. Although it is argued that a higher osmolality is inevitable when adequate amounts of carbohydrate are to be included in sports drinks, the optimum amount of carbohydrate necessary to improve exercise performance has not been clearly established."

Junk Food

This term has no specific meaning. It is an invented label which has, for example, been applied indiscriminately to all fast food and all snack foods. It has also been applied to any food high in fat and/or sugar (and so in calories) but low in other nutrients. However, there is no evidence that such foods are other than acceptable as part of a balanced diet

Meat

'Meat' means the flesh, including fat and the skin, rind, gristle and sinew in amounts naturally associated with the flesh, of any animal or bird which is normally used for human consumption, but including only those parts of the carcass listed in Part I of Schedule 2 of the UK Meat Products and Spreadable Fish Products Regulations 1984. However, Regulations now also exclude those parts named as Specified Risk Materials.

Note that from 1 January 2003 EU Member States will have to give effect to a Directive amending Directive 2000/13/EC, limiting the definition of "meat" to skeletal–attached muscle plus not more than 25% muscle–adhering fat and connective tissue (not more than 10% in the case of birds and rabbits), requiring systematic indication of the species from which the meat comes, and excluding "mechanically separated meat" from the definition.

Natural

[The following was added to the end of the definition]

However, see also the FAC Review of the use of the terms Fresh, Pure, Natural etc. in Food Labelling 2001, in connection with which the UK Food Standards Agency has announced an intention to legislate www.foodstandards.gov.uk/press_releases/uk_press/2001/pr010725.htm

Organic

(See FAQ part 1, No. 20 for comparisons between organic and other foods)

Organic food can be defined as "the product of a farming system which avoids the use of man–made fertilisers, pesticides, growth regulators and livestock feed additives. Instead the system relies on crop rotation, animal and plant manures, some hand weeding and biological pest control". This definition serves to distinguish

the use of the word 'organic' in this context from its more traditional scientific meaning as a description of a carbon-containing molecule. 'Organic' is the description used only in English-speaking countries; in other markets 'Bio' , 'Oko' or 'Eco' are appropriate. The Organic Products Regulations 1992 as amended implement EU Council Regulation EEC No 2091/91 (as amended in 1995) on organic production of agricultural products and foodstuffs. The use of the word 'organic' is restricted to agricultural crops and livestock and products made from them, in compliance with the detailed provisions of Annexes I, II and III of the Council Regulation.

Organic processed foods are labelled depending on the proportion of organic ingredients present:

- * Category 1: Product contains a minimum of 95% organic ingredients by weight. Product can be labelled 'Organic' eg Organic Cornflakes
- * Category 2: Product contains 70 – 95% organic ingredients by weight. Product can be labelled 'Made with Organic Ingredients' eg Tomato Ketchup made with Organic Tomatoes.

Regulation 2092/91 as amended contains a list of the non-organic ingredients which can be included in an otherwise organic food – for example water, salt, permitted food additives, processing aids, carrier solvents and flavourings. The Regulations also specifically exclude the use of irradiated or genetically modified (GM) ingredients in organic food.

Throughout the EU each member state has a national Control Body. In the UK it is UKROFS, (The Register of Organic Food Standards) which regulates the activities of six UK Certification Bodies, who are the organisations charged with inspecting and regulating UK organic producers and manufacturers. The largest Certification Body is the Soil Association, which currently undertakes 80% of all certification in the UK. The other UK Certification Bodies are Organic Farmers & Growers, Scottish Organic Producers Association, Demeter, Organic Food Federation (OFF) and Irish Organic Farmers & Growers Association. Other prominent EU certification bodies include Ecocert (France), Naturland (Germany) and Skal (Holland), whilst OCIA, OGBA, QAI and FVO are the prominent certification bodies in the USA. The production of organic food requires the same involvement of professional food scientists and technologists and is subject to the same requirements of good manufacturing practice and food safety as the rest of the food industry, but is also subject to specific additional legal requirements as to cultivation, composition and labelling.

Risk

The probability that a particular adverse consequence results from a hazard within a stated time under stated conditions. "Risk assessment" should take account of both the probability of

occurrence and its seriousness if it occurs. See Hazard and Risk Analysis.

Risk Analysis

This comprises risk assessment, risk management and risk communication. Risk assessment requires expertise both in the product or process in which the risk has been identified, and in modern risk assessment techniques. While experts also have a responsibility to contribute to risk management (i.e. the action to be taken in relation to the assessed risk), it is not the province of experts alone; in relation to a product or process within a food operation, it is the responsibility of top management; in the wider context of food legislation it is the responsibility of the appropriate governmental authority after consultation. Consultation is part of the process of risk communication, which should take place both before and after risk management.

—
That's it for the changes! Now on to New User Information. No need to read the rest of this "NEWS" section unless you're new to the group.

INFORMATION FOR NEW USERS

NOTES ON 'NETTIQUETTE':

Please read also FAQ 1/3, Part I: GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR POSTING IN SCI.BIO.FOOD–SCIENCE

There has been a slow but sure trend in recent years for some posters to get emotional or to bait emotional debates with their postings. This is never a good thing, since discussions most commonly deteriorate into name–calling and so on. Others wonder why their posts hardly get any responses from this group. All this is discussed here.

Emotional debates are common in any topic for which adherents hold passionate, but opposing, beliefs. One of life's many paradoxes holds that if you shout, you will not be heard. Keep your conversations polite and cordial. The basis of politeness means that you must realise that this is a text medium, and people cannot see your body language to find out what you intend with these words, and as a result most people tend to assume the worst. You have to be extra careful in how you word things with others.

However, there are many other reasons your postings do not get desirable responses. First of all, realise that this is a food

science newsgroup, and that most of the posters tend to toe the party line of science. If you find this hard to take, there are many other newsgroups that you might find more friendly. In FAQ 1/3, for example, the newsgroup has many explicitly–stated goals, along with a newsgroup charter. These were agreed to and voted on over 10 years ago. Charters and statements of goals are a fact of life of all newsgroups under the sci.* hierarchy, and other hierarchies as well.

While we welcome posts from anybody and everybody, you must ensure that your postings are on–topic. Some newsgroups dealing with other aspects of foods which we don't deal with:

sci.med.nutrition rec.food.preserving rec.food.cooking
rec.food.recipes alt.food.wine alt.food.fat–free
rec.food–veg rec.food.veg.cooking alt.support.diet
alt.food.vegan alt.food.vegan.science
alt.animals.ethics.vegetarian alt.sport.weightlifting.vegetarian
alt.support.diet.* (there are several newsgroups in this hierarchy)

If you wonder why your posting garners few or no responses, it could be due to several reasons, including: 1) Nobody understood your post; 2) your post was not on–topic for the newsgroup, 3) your post showed an obvious intent at baiting an argument, and people properly ignored it, or 4) your post perhaps gave nothing for others to respond to.

—

This FAQ has been accepted to the *.answers newsgroups, and can be found in both
sci.answers and news.answers.

DOWNLOADING This FAQ: This is not an exhaustive list. Pick a site nearest you. All paths end in "sci/food–science–faq/" except for Gopher sites, which use menus, and FSP sites, which have protocols that I am unfamiliar with. FSP stands for "File Service Protocol". There are several other sites not mentioned here. To get the very latest list, look under:

<<ftp://rtfm.mit.edu/pub/usenet/news.answers/news–answers/introduction>>

They include Gopher sites, FTP sites, FSP sites, and web sites in Europe, North America, South America, Africa, Asia, and Australia. This list is intended only as a representative sample.

From Canada:

<<gopher://jupiter.sun.csd.unb.ca:70>>

This is the only Canadian FAQ repository, located in the maritime province of New Brunswick.

From Germany:

sci.answers: [sci.bio.food–science] Additions and Changes to FAQ, and New User Info

via FSP from: ftp.Germany.EU.net, port 2001

<<ftp://ftp.Germany.EU.net:80/pub/newsarchive/news.answers/>>

This FTP site uses compression. You must download a GZIP decompression package to see the text, which should be available at this site.

From Hong Kong:

<<ftp://ftp.hk.super.net/mirror/faqs/>>

One of many Asian sites.

From Mexico and Central America:

<<ftp://ftp.mty.itesm.mx/pub/mirrors/usenet/news.answers/>>

This FTP site uses compression. You must download an UNCOMPRESS package to see the text, which should be available at this site.

From South Africa:

<<ftp://ftp.is.co.za/usenet/news.answers/>>

From the United Kingdom:

<<ftp://src.doc.ic.ac.uk/usenet/news-faqs/news.answers/>>

via FSP from: src.doc.ic.ac.uk, port 21

From the United States:

<<ftp://rtfm.mit.edu/pub/usenet-by-group/news.answers/>>

<<ftp://rtfm.mit.edu/pub/usenet-by-group/alt.answers/>>

<<ftp://rtfm.mit.edu/pub/usenet-by-hierarchy/news.answers/>>

<<ftp://rtfm.mit.edu/pub/usenet-by-hierarchy/alt.answers/>>

rtfm.mit.edu is the central repository for most of the official FAQs that appear on the Usenet. In fact, this is the place where you are *guaranteed* the most up-to-date FAQ, since they have to do the auto-posting.

<<ftp://ftp.mirrors.aol.com/pub/rtfm/usenet/news-answers/>>

From the Web:

Old postings to sbfs can be found at <http://dejanews.com>, using "sci.bio.food–science" as a search string.

Other WWW Pages: Check out a site nearest you:

Germany: <<http://www.Germany.EU.net:80/>>

This actually leads to a search engine where the FAQ must be downloaded via FTP as above. The files are compressed with GZIP.

The UK: <<http://src.doc.ic.ac.uk/usenet/news-faqs/news.answers/>>

This is a "bare text" web page. In other words, there are no live web links. It is a plain text FAQ.

<<http://www.lib.ox.ac.uk/internet/news/faq/sci.bio.food–science.html>>

This is the other British Homepage worth mentioning, which will hopefully be updated soon. All links mentioned in this FAQ are live, and is a good starting point in surfing to various food science web sites. See "SCI.BIO.FOOD–SCIENCE ON THE WORLD–WIDE WEB" below:

The USA: <<http://www.smartpages.com/faqs/>>

—

A SHORT NOTE ON FTP RETRIEVAL OF THIS FAQ (for Windows users with SLIP/PPP):

If you find your web browser too slow on your system, a better way to FTP is by use of freeware like WS–FTP. It can be downloaded via anonymous FTP from <<ftp://129.29.64.246/pub/msdos>>. WS–FTP is free for private, household use. A fee is required for commercial use. You may find the transfer on WS–FTP is much faster, and that it uses far less memory. Also, WS–FTP allows you to maintain a menu of your favourite FTP sites. This is not intended to be an endorsement of WS–FTP, and others are available. __

SCI.BIO.FOOD–SCIENCE FAQ ON THE WORLD–WIDE WEB:

Our FAQ has been converted to HTML for users of the World–Wide Web. It may be found at two locations:

<<http://www.landfield.com/faqs/by–newsgroup/sci/sci.bio.food–science.html>>

or

<<http://dejanews.com/>>

The first site is a direct link to our FAQ; the second requires you to fill out a search form for the correct newsgroup, since DejaNews lists ALL news articles posted on the Internet over several months. In both cases, the great thing about

seeing out FAQ on HTML is that all of the links we mention are LIVE links. That is, if you have Netscape, you may point and click on our FAQ from any web site we mention to wherever those links take you.

I also have my own personal web page, with most of the links mentioned in this FAQ. The intent was to write a simple web page that was easy to move around in. You may find it a bit more user–friendly than the web pages offered at landfield.com or by Deja News. I won't be updating it as much as the FAQ, so it may not have the most current URLs. I stress here that the entire FAQ

is not on my home page – just the links mentioned in it. Visit the site and tell

me what you think! The web site is at

<<http://www3.sympatico.ca/pking123>>

You are given a choice as to the kind of web page you want, based on your browser capability and download speed.

—

HISTORICAL POSTINGS OF SBFS:

Another item worthy of mentioning is the finding of

<<http://www.ibiblio.org/london/rural/food/sci.bio.food–science>>

It is at the University of North Carolina (sunsite.unc.edu), and contains historical postings from the first day the newsgroup began (May, 1995), up until December 1996. I consider it to be a valuable resource, and would appreciate it if anyone else finds archived postings from our newsgroup that proceed from December 1996 onward.

—

VIEWING THE SBFS FAQ ON NETSCAPE 2.2 and above:

Of the Web Browsers, I have found Netscape to have the best news reader. This is because the Netscape's news browser turns any mention of a web URL into a live link, as well. What is ideal about this kind of arrangement is that if you point and click on the "blue" URL reference on the news browser, the web page will pop up in a new window. That means can surf the 'net without ever losing track of our news articles. —

Professional food scientists, academics, and others involved in the food industry are invited to list their "favourite", or "most highly recommended" textbooks in the food science field to be added to the FAQ for the benefit of non–food scientists. The following format is preferred for ease of editing (loosely based on the Journal of Food Science):

SUBJECT: Author(Year). Title. Edition. City: Publisher. ISBN. Comments.

The basic idea is to provide enough information for someone to walk into a library or bookstore and order it. The ISBN number is essential. Comments are optional.

—

PERSONAL FOOD SCIENCE WEB PAGES:

News for persons maintaining a "personal" food science web page: Jim Eilers (jreilers@interaccess.com) is maintaining a list of persons who are maintaining a home page of Food Science links. If you are such a person, email him at jreilers@interaccess.com, and if you wish to view his homepage, "surf" to:

<http://homepage.interaccess.com/~jreilers/foodsci.htm>

—

"ETHNIC" FOOD PREPARATION METHODS ON THE WEB

Ralph, Rachel, and I have proposed a new sub–section dealing with an important and as of yet overlooked aspect of foods: Ethnic (non–American and non–British) food preparations. Specifically, we are looking for web pages dealing with details on the preparation of foods that are described as "halal", "kosher", "pareve", and so on – you fill in the terminologies for your ethnic group. How are these foods prepared, inspected, and manufactured? What does the

consumer expect in terms of organoleptic properties and health benefits of such foods? Are there any mass–produced foods that have the designation? How does a person in that ethnic group know they are buying a food prepared according to their ethnic or religious doctrines?

If you know of any web pages that describe or even mention these things, please send your suggestions to Paul King at <mailto://pking@idirect.com>

—

You are all encouraged to contact one of us if you have suggestions additions, or other 'major' questions we haven't thought of. Our names and email addresses are:

Rachel Zemser, creator of the newsgroup sci.bio.food–science
<mailto://rachel.zemser@unilever.com>

J Ralph Blanchfield, Food Science, Food Technology & Food Law
Consultant, Chair, IFST Member Relations & Services Committee and Web
Editor, IFST Web on the WWW <mailto://jralphb@easynet.co.uk>

Paul King, Creator and Maintainer of the List of Common Abbreviations, and
New User Info <mailto://pking@idirect.com>

For a glossary of scientific, marketing, industry, technical and legal terms of relevance to food science, see FAQ 2 of 3. For a list of common questions and answers about food and food science, see FAQ 3 of 3.

– Paul King

----- End of forwarded message -----

----- End of forwarded message -----

----- End of forwarded message -----