

## Taco Bell, Pizza Hut go natural, but no one knows what that really means

Last week, Taco Bell and Pizza Hut both announced they are going natural. Goodbye Yellow-5. Ciao trans fat. Sayonara unsustainable palm oil. “Today’s customers want simplicity, transparency and choice in the foods they eat,” [proclaimed the Bell’s broadsheet](#). And while it’s great that fast food giants are listening to the public, there’s one problem: In terms of describing food, “natural” is almost completely meaningless.

Online, a chorus of voices sing about natural foods, but with little harmony. It might mean antibiotic-free to some, while others target GMOs. Then there’s the confusingly powerful cries for chemical-free foods (everything is chemicals, people). Even the FDA admits there’s no satisfying answer. That wishy-washiness is a problem. OK sure, maybe nobody has a definition of natural, but we all kind of agree what it means. But what if that shared-ish definition changes? What if next year natural means my hamburger contains no robot parts?

Granted, the Bell and the Hut (both owned by Yum! Brands) each offered some specifics, but without a standardized, enforceable definition, there’s no guarantee that they’ll follow through. Or maybe they will, and in that case the lack of an enforceable definition for natural will hurt them, as other companies looking to cash in on natural’s now-enriched branding exploit the label with crappy products.

**The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: [America Needs a Real Definition of What a ‘Natural’ Food Is](#)**