

POLLAN JOURNAL ENTRY #3

In Part One of *In Defense of Food*, Michael Pollan makes the case that reductionism in modern food science has distorted our understanding of food and its relationship to human health, creating a pseudoscience he labels “nutritionism,” an ideology that separates nutrients from whole foods and leads, ironically, to poorer health rather than better health. In Part Two, Pollan traces the development of the diseases of western civilization that, in his view, are the direct result of our collective faith in nutritionism.

Glancing through the chapter titles in Parts One & Two, sum up, in your own words, the main components of his argument thus far. Then preview the chapter titles in Part Three. What predictions can you now make about the direction his argument will take in its culminating section? If the current paradigm* isn't working, what new paradigm will Pollan recommend?

Write without stopping for 20 minutes.

*Paradigm: A set of assumptions, concepts, values, and practices that constitutes a way of viewing reality.

--thefreedictionary.com