

Chapter 9

The Global Legal Landscape of Food Labeling: Front-Of-Pack Labeling and its Implications for Ultra-Processed Foods

Arturo Reyes¹

<https://doi.org/10.61728/AE26000121>



¹ Senior Corporate Counsel and M.B.A. candidate specializing in the regulation and advertising of foods, dietary supplements, and cosmetics. He advises on compliance with FDA, FTC, and California Proposition 65 requirements. He has contributed to the development of public health initiatives for the City of New York and served as a legal consultant for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Rome, Italy. His work bridges law, business, and nutrition, and he has provided counsel on front-of-pack labeling and the regulation of ultra-processed foods in Mexico, the United States, and the European Union

I. Introduction: The Legal Evolution of Front-of-Pack Nutrition Labeling

The global rise in diet-related noncommunicable diseases such as obesity, type 2 diabetes, and cardiovascular disease has prompted governments to adopt legal strategies to regulate ultra-processed foods (UPFs). These foods, high in added sugars, sodium, and saturated fats, are increasingly linked to adverse health outcomes and rising public health costs. Front-of-pack nutrition labeling (FOPNL) has emerged as a key regulatory tool to promote public health, fulfill duties to inform consumers, and shape marketing practices that influence dietary behavior (Popkin et al., 2021).

FOPNL has been linked to greater transparency, product reformulation, and restrictions on child-directed advertising (WHO, 2022). Countries have adopted varied approaches, from voluntary logos to mandatory warning labels, shaped by national legal systems and health priorities (Taillie et al., 2020).

This chapter examines FOPNL across multiple countries, with a primary focus on Mexico, Italy, and the United States (U.S.) to explain how legal systems affect the way FOPNL is used or opposed. Mexico's system reflects its constitutional right to health and international human rights law (Crosbie et al., 2023). Italy's opposition to Nutri-Score, a color-coded, interpretive label that grades food products from "A" (healthiest) to "E" (least healthy), underscores tensions between protecting cultural foods and complying with European Union (EU) market rules (Camera dei Deputati, 2021). The U.S. lacks a standardized FOPNL scheme, and its regulatory framework remains fragmented, relying primarily on voluntary industry initiatives and nutrient-specific disclosures (FDA, 2025). These comparisons reveal how health rights, cultural identity, and speech protections structure national approaches.

FOPNL has become a defining element of food governance, influencing laws, corporate behavior, and nutrition policy. Yet, implementation

efforts have encountered resistance and trade-based concerns, particularly when national systems diverge from *Codex Alimentarius* norms, which are a set of international food standards developed by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) (Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2023; WTO, 2020).

While nutrient-based labeling has long shaped food policy, the rise of UPFs presents new regulatory challenges. The concept of UPFs was introduced in 2010 by Brazilian researchers led by Carlos Monteiro, who developed the *NOVA* classification system to categorize foods based on processing levels (Monteiro et al., 2019). *NOVA* distinguishes minimally processed staples, such as bread and cheese, from highly processed, ready-to-eat products that dominate global food markets (Melillo, 2023). Unlike conventional systems focused on nutrients like sugar or fat, *NOVA* highlights how industrial techniques and additives affect food quality and health outcomes.

Traditional labeling systems do not account for the processing methods that define UPFs (Southey, 2024). As a result, a product may meet nutrient thresholds yet remain unhealthy due to artificial sweeteners, emulsifiers, or refined starches. As debates over food policy evolve, UPFs have sparked growing calls to regulate not just what foods contain, but how they are made, shifting attention from individual nutrients to the processes and structures that define modern industrial food (thinkglobal-health.org; cfs.gov.hk; The Washington Post).

In response, FOPNL systems are beginning to evolve. Reforms such as Nutri-Score algorithm updates in Europe and mandatory warning labels in Latin America reflect a shift toward recognizing the broader health implications of industrial food processing (Monteiro et al., 2019; WHO, 2023; Julia et al., 2022).

II. The Legal Role of FOPNL in Global Public Health Regulation

International bodies such as the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), World Health Organization (WHO), UNICEF, and the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to health have recognized interpretive

FOPNL schemes as legitimate tools for fulfilling the right to adequate nutrition (Pan American Health Organization, n.d.; UNICEF, 2023; UN OHCHR, 2020; WHO, 2022).

FOPNL has been widely adopted in Latin America as a regulatory strategy grounded in the constitutional and international right to health. Mexico, for example, has based its mandatory warning label system on both its constitutional protections and its obligations under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), which supports government action to ensure public access to health-related food information. Chile and Peru, also ICESCR parties, have aligned their labeling systems with PAHO and WHO public health models, which recommend FOPNL as a key tool to promote healthier diets and reduce noncommunicable diseases. By contrast, EU member states generally frame FOPNL as a matter of consumer protection and market harmonization, rather than as a human rights obligation (European Commission, n.d.).

Within the EU, Italy has opposed the Nutri-Score system, arguing that it not only undermines traditional foods but also disrupts the EU internal market, a system that enables the free movement of goods, services, capital, and people across member states. Italy contends that differing FOPNL systems, like Nutri-Score, risk creating trade barriers that disadvantage iconic Italian products in other EU countries.

At the global level, the World Trade Organization (WTO) plays a critical role in regulating trade-related technical requirements. Under the *Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement*, member countries must ensure that regulations like FOPNL are not more trade-restrictive than necessary and are applied in a non-discriminatory, evidence-based manner (WTO, n.d.).

Codex Alimentarius, developed by the Codex Commission under WHO and the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, provides voluntary standards used by over dozens of countries to guide national food regulations. Its 2021 update to the Nutrition Labelling Guidelines (CAC/GL 2-1985) included FOPNL but stopped short of prescribing a specific interpretive model. Instead, *Codex Alimentarius* affirms that labeling must be proportionate, non-misleading, and grounded in science, principles that mirror WTO trade rules (Codex, 2021; Crosbie, Carriedo, & Schmidt,

2022). While this flexibility has enabled national innovation, it has also led to trade tensions when FOPNL systems are seen as discriminatory. For instance, Mexico's adoption of octagonal warning labels in 2020 based on PAHO's nutrient profile drew complaints from trading partners who claimed the measure was burdensome and discouraged purchases (Food Marketing Institute, 2025).

Despite these disputes, the global shift toward mandatory, government-led FOPNL reflects growing international acceptance of such measures as legally and scientifically valid. Initiatives like PAHO's Plan of Action and statements by the UN Special Rapporteur affirm that states may not only adopt but be required to implement interpretive labeling to protect the right to health (PAHO, n.d.; UN OHCHR, 2020).

This section explores the legal evolution of FOPNL across multiple jurisdictions, with a closer analysis of Mexico, Italy, and the U.S. It begins in Latin America, where Chile and Mexico have led with mandatory labeling, and turns to Italy's legal and cultural opposition to France's Nutri-Score. These developments illustrate the legal and policy tensions between public health goals and international trade obligations, especially as countries seek more assertive national strategies.

III. Latin America's Shift to Front-of-Pack Warning Labels

In 2016, Chile became a global reference point for FOPNL with the enactment of Law No. 20.606 on the Nutritional Composition of Food and its Advertising. The law introduced bold black octagonal warning labels on packaged products exceeding thresholds for sugar, sodium, saturated fat, or calories. Labels such as "*Exceso Azúcar*" (Excess Sugar) provided direct information at the point of purchase. It also restricted child-directed marketing, banning cartoon characters and animations on products with elevated levels of these critical nutrients (Reyes & Rainer, 2021).

Evaluations to date suggest that Chile's FOPNL approach has contributed to changes in food labeling practices and consumer decision-making. A 2020 study by Taillie et al. found that purchases of high-sugar beverages declined by 23.7 percent within 18 months, alongside increased

sales of healthier alternatives (Taillie et al., 2020). A 2021 follow-up showed families were purchasing 27 percent less sugar and 37 percent less salt from labeled products. In response to reduced consumption of UPFs, many companies reformulated products to lower added sugars, sodium, and saturated fats, aiming to avoid triggering warning labels (Pomeranz, 2024).

This model also inspired regulatory momentum across Latin America, particularly in Mexico. Other countries followed with variations: Peru and Uruguay adopted similar black octagon warnings, Colombia introduced FOP labels in 2020, and Brazil launched its own system in 2022 using a black and white magnifying glass symbol (Alvarez-Cano, Caverro, & Diez-Canseco, 2022; Government of Uruguay, 2018; Government of Colombia, 2021; ANVISA, 2020; Congreso de la República del Perú, 2013).

These reforms build on long-standing legal commitments to health rights found in many Latin American constitutions, providing a solid foundation for regulatory innovation. In countries, such as Chile, Mexico, and Colombia, this right provides a foundation for adopting public health measures that prioritize consumer protection and child welfare. It often outweighs commercial speech protections, enabling stronger regulation of food labeling and advertising than in jurisdictions where corporate speech enjoys greater constitutional safeguards (Global Health Advocacy Incubator, 2024).

Multinational food and beverage companies have responded to Latin American FOPNL policies through litigation and trade-related concerns. In Mexico, companies such as Coca-Cola FEMSA and Kellogg's filed *amparo* lawsuits, filed *amparo* lawsuits, a type of legal challenge used to oppose government regulations (Expansión, 2021; Florko, 2023). At the international level, industry groups including the International Council of Beverages Associations, the International Food and Beverage Alliance, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have raised concerns before the WTO, arguing that mandatory warning labels may conflict with the *Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement* (Crosbie et al., 2023; Crosbie et al., 2020; U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 2025).

Despite ongoing legal and trade debates, FOPNL policies in Latin America have helped shape global discussions on regulating UPFs. These

measures show that FOPNL functions not only as a tool for consumer transparency but also as a regulatory mechanism shaping how food is marketed and sold, reinforcing consumer protections, and advancing public health goals.

IV. Mexico's Legal Innovation: Rights-Based Food Labeling and Regulatory Defense

Mexico's FOPNL policy draws legal authority from Article 4 of Mexico's Constitution, which guarantees the right to health, and is reinforced by Mexico's obligations under instruments, like the ICESCR. This framework treats nutrition labeling not merely as regulation but as a means of fulfilling the state's duty to uphold fundamental rights, particularly the right to adequate food and health. In contrast, Italy frames its resistance to EU-wide labeling around cultural sovereignty, and the U.S. constrains reforms through First Amendment protections of commercial speech. Mexico's rights-based model has shaped the design of its warning labels and provided a strong legal foundation to defend the policy against constitutional challenges by industry actors.

Mexico positioned itself at the forefront of Latin American nutrition policy reform by adopting mandatory FOPNL, building on Chile's landmark 2016 law that set a regional precedent for regulating UPFs and diet-related diseases. The earlier Guideline Daily Amount (GDA) system, promoted by industry, proved ineffective, especially among populations with low health literacy, and was limited in its ability to convey meaningful nutritional information. In response, Mexican regulators replaced it in 2020 with bold, black octagonal warnings indicating excessive sugar, sodium, or saturated fat, an interpretive format intended to improve transparency and inform consumer choice (Vargas-Meza et al., 2022).

This regulatory shift has withstood legal challenges. In 2024, the Mexican Supreme Court upheld NOM-051, the regulation mandating FOPNL, affirming that it advances compelling public interests in health and nutrition, particularly among children. The Court cited the constitutional right to health and Mexico's treaty obligations as a sufficient legal basis for requiring clear FOPNL. It rejected claims that the labels

infringed on commercial speech or exceeded regulatory authority, emphasizing that the warnings were factual, science-based, and necessary to address the country's public health crisis.

Since taking office in 2024, President Claudia Sheinbaum has reaffirmed the importance of nutrition labeling as part of her administration's preventive health agenda. She has underscored the role of clear labeling in empowering consumer choice and reducing chronic disease, reinforcing its alignment with national strategies to combat non-communicable diseases (Garduño, 2024).

a. Warning Labels and Child Protections

Mexico's 2020 amendment to NOM-051 introduced black octagonal front-of-pack warning labels for products exceeding thresholds for added sugars, sodium, saturated fats, or calories. Section 7.1.3 requires the warning "CONTIENE EDULCORANTES, NO RECOMENDABLE EN NIÑOS" (*Contains sweeteners, not recommended for children*) for non-sugar sweeteners, while Section 7.1.4 mandates "CONTIENE CAFEÍNA, EVITAR EN NIÑOS" (*Contains caffeine, avoid in children*) for products with caffeine (Secretaría de Economía & Secretaría de Salud, 2010). These warnings reflect a broader public health objective grounded in scientific evidence and constitutional protections for health (Global Health Advocacy Incubator, 2024).

A key innovation of NOM-051 was the prohibition on child-directed marketing for any product bearing a warning label, effective April 2021. This restriction applies across all media and bans mascots, licensed characters, animations, and celebrity endorsements. The change marked a cultural shift, as some of Mexico's most iconic food mascots were removed from packaging. The Bimbo bear, Gansito's penguin, and the Choco Krispis tiger, which are long central to brand recognition and emotional loyalty, disappeared from shelves. Their removal led to packaging redesigns and marketing updates, highlighting the regulation's far-reaching impact on brand identity and consumer perception (Martínez, 2021).

b. Legal Challenges to NOM 051

These reforms were met with substantial legal resistance. By 2022, NOM-051 had prompted 162 legal challenges, including at least 135 amparo lawsuits (infoAlimentario, 2022). The *amparo* is a constitutional mechanism in Mexico that allows individuals or corporations to challenge government actions that allegedly violate constitutional rights. It serves as a judicial review tool that can suspend or invalidate regulations pending judicial interpretation of their legality.

Major multinational companies such as Coca-Cola and Kellogg were among the first to file amparos, objecting to both the warning labels and the ban on mascots. ConMéxico, an industry group representing large, multinational companies coordinated multiple suits asserting that NOM-051 violated branding rights, imposed disproportionate restrictions on commercial expression, and encroached on intellectual property protections (The National Law Review, 2020; Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment, 2022).

In response to Mexico's implementation of NOM-051, some companies raised concerns under international trade law. They argued that these labels conflicted with Mexico's obligations under the WTO's *Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade* and the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA). Specifically, they argued that the warning labels constituted non-tariff barriers, or regulatory measures, such as labeling requirements, which can impede international trade when they diverge from internationally recognized standards like the Codex Alimentarius. These deviations, they claimed, could set a precedent leading to trade disputes or increased scrutiny from international trade bodies. This situation highlights the broader debate on balancing a nation's right to implement public health measures with its commitments to international trade agreements (UNICEF, 2022).

c. Judicial Enforcement of NOM 051

In April 2024, the Mexican Supreme Court (SCJN) issued a landmark ruling upholding the constitutionality of NOM-051's FOPNL provi-

sions. The Court ruled in *Amparo en Revisión 269/2023*, a case brought by Santa Clara Mercantil de Pachuca, a Coca-Cola subsidiary, which argued that the requirements imposed excessive burdens on commerce and infringed rights related to branding and consumer communication. In its 2024 ruling, the Supreme Court reaffirmed that NOM-051 fulfills constitutional duties to safeguard public health. (Suprema Corte de Justicia de la Nación, 2023; Saludable Saberlo, 2024).

SCJN's decision emphasized that the regulation does not impose an unreasonable burden on speech or commerce but fulfills the government's constitutional duty to protect vulnerable populations from preventable diet-related diseases.

Beyond its legal impact, the ruling carries broader significance. It reflects a broader jurisprudential trend in Mexico recognizing the role of law in shaping food environments and public health outcomes. It also strengthens Latin America's position as a global leader in rights-based food regulation.

V. Italy's Opposition to EU Labeling Standards

Italy's approach to food labeling centers on cultural sovereignty and legal protection of traditional foods. Unlike Mexico's rights-based model or the U.S.'s constitutional speech focus, Italy frames labeling as a defense of culinary identity and national autonomy within a harmonized EU framework.

a. Legal Basis for European Union Nutrition Labeling

The EU's legal framework for food labeling is structured around two complementary components: horizontal rules, which apply across all food products, and vertical rules, which target specific food categories. Horizontal rules establish the foundational principles for food safety, labeling, and consumer protection, including the General Food Law Regulation (Regulation (EC) No. 178/2002), which outlines risk analysis and traceability standards for the entire food chain (European Parliament and Council, 2002). These are reinforced by the Nutrition and Health Claims

Regulation (Regulation (EC) No. 1924/2006), which restricts misleading claims and requires scientific substantiation, and the Food Information to Consumers Regulation (Regulation (EU) No. 1169/2011), which mandates clear and accurate labeling, including standardized back-of-pack nutrition information (European Parliament and Council, 2006; 2011).

In parallel, vertical rules supplement this overarching framework by imposing tailored requirements on specific product groups such as olive oil, honey, wine, and infant formula. These sector-specific laws address the unique characteristics and marketing challenges of each product, thereby contributing to a more precise regulatory system (European Court of Auditors, 2024). For example, Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 establishes detailed marketing standards for olive oil, including labeling of origin, quality categories (e.g., extra virgin, virgin), and packaging requirements to prevent consumer deception and ensure product authenticity.

These vertical rules are intended to work alongside the general EU labeling requirements outlined in Regulation (EU) No. 1169/2011, which cover most prepackaged food products.

Regulation (EU) No. 1169/2011 provides the legal foundation for the EU's approach to FOPNL. Article 30 establishes standardized requirements for mandatory back-of-pack nutrition declarations on most prepackaged foods, while Article 35 allows Member States and food business operators to adopt voluntary FOPNL schemes, provided they are based on scientific evidence, are not misleading, and are intended to help consumers make more informed dietary choices. Additionally, Article 35(5) empowers the European Commission to propose harmonized FOPNL rules at the EU level if differing national schemes are found to impede the functioning of the internal market (e.g., creating trade barriers or inconsistent consumer messaging that complicates cross-border sales). A product labeled with Nutri-Score in France may carry a warning that conflicts with how the same product is presented in Italy, where the NutriInform Battery is used, leading to consumer confusion and obstacles to uniform marketing strategies (European Parliament and Council, 2011).

Although this legal framework grants the Commission the authority to act, it has not invoked Article 35(5) to mandate a harmonized FOPNL system. This restraint reflects a combination of political resistance,

particularly from Italy and Greece, alongside legal principles such as subsidiarity and proportionality, which limit EU intervention when national-level action is sufficient and require that measures not exceed what is necessary.

Several Member States have moved ahead with national FOPNL systems, with France and others supporting Nutri-Score, while Italy has championed the NutrInform Battery, arguing that Nutri-Score penalizes traditional foods and lacks nuance. This regulatory divergence has not only fragmented the internal market but also exposed the challenges of balancing cultural preferences with unified public health objectives (European Court of Auditors, 2024).

b. Diverging National Models: Nutri-Score vs. NutrInform Battery

i. France's Nutri-Score: Legal Adoption, Public Health Role, and Evolving Critiques

France developed and introduced Nutri-Score as part of its national public health strategy, adopting the system in 2017 through a ministerial decree following consultations with health authorities, consumer groups, and industry stakeholders (Santé publique France, 2021). Created by French public health researchers and supported by the Ministry of Health, Nutri-Score was designed to modernize nutrition labeling and improve dietary outcomes. It was implemented as a voluntary FOPNL scheme under the flexibility provided by EU Regulation No. 1169/2011, and it remains one of the most advanced interpretive systems currently in use in the EU.

Nutri-Score uses a five-color, “A”-to- “E” scale based on a nutrient profiling algorithm calculated per 100 grams or milliliters. The algorithm assigns positive points for fiber, protein, fruits, vegetables, legumes, and nuts, and negative points for energy, saturated fat, sugars, and sodium (Santé publique France, n.d.). For example, a sugary cereal initially rated “C” may improve to a “B” or “A” following reformulation. This structure incentivizes food manufacturers to reformulate products, although

critics argue it may mask the ultra-processed nature of some items, a concern addressed by complementary classification systems such as *NOVA* (Southey, 2024).

French authorities have positioned Nutri-Score as a central public health tool, aimed at guiding consumers toward healthier choices and reducing the burden of non-communicable diseases. France's leadership in designing and promoting Nutri-Score has influenced wider adoption across Europe, with public health authorities in Belgium, Spain, Germany, and other countries officially endorsing the system (Santé publique France, 2021). Major companies, including Nestlé, initially supported the initiative and reformulated popular products like Chocapic and Nesquik cereals to improve their Nutri-Score ratings (LaNutrition.fr, 2022).

Critics also note that Nutri-Score does not account for processing methods. As a result, some reformulated products meeting nutrient thresholds may still contain ingredients associated with UPFs (LaNutrition.fr, 2022; Galan et al., 2020; Mortoray, 2023). This gap reflects a broader challenge: most food labeling laws were not designed to address industrial processing. As legal and scientific consensus grows around processing-related health risks, there may be pressure to update labeling tools accordingly.

Between 2022 and 2023, French authorities revised the Nutri-Score algorithm. A 2024 study by Sorbonne Paris Nord University and Santé Publique France found that 87.5% of UPFs were rated "C" to "E" under the updated model, compared to 77.9% under the original. The revisions most significantly affected flavored drinks, sweetened dairy products, and certain breads, while scores for legumes and low-sugar waters remained stable. These reforms reaffirm France's evidence-based commitment to improving food labeling but also underscore divisions within the EU over harmonization. The central issue remains how to merge nutrient-based labeling with growing calls to address food processing.

Despite initial support and product reformulation, tensions surrounding Nutri-Score persisted. By 2024–2025, Nestlé began to retreat from the labeling scheme, citing ongoing scientific debate, consumer confusion, and the absence of an EU-wide harmonized framework (Just Food, 2024; FoodNavigator, 2025). In Switzerland, Nestlé started removing

Nutri-Score from its packaging, reaffirming its commitment to transparency but underscoring concerns about the label's scientific basis and inconsistent implementation across markets (SwissInfo, 2024; Yahoo Finance, 2023).

ii. Italy's Legal Challenge to Nutri-Score: Cultural Sovereignty, NutrInform Battery, and EU Harmonization

Italy has mounted a sustained legal and political campaign to oppose Nutri-Score as the EU's harmonized FOPNL system. Central to its argument is that Nutri-Score's algorithm unfairly penalizes traditional Mediterranean foods, such as Parmigiano Reggiano, prosciutto di Parma, and extra virgin olive oil, based on fat or sodium content, without considering their broader dietary, cultural, and nutritional context (Wanat & Leali, 2020).

In response to Nutri-Score, Italy launched its own voluntary FOPNL system, the NutrInform Battery, via a 2020 ministerial decree (Notification No. 2020/31/I). Unlike Nutri-Score's color-coded summary per 100g, NutrInform uses battery icons to show the percentage of recommended daily intake per portion for energy, fats, sugars, and salt. It favors numeric precision over interpretive scoring and uses a neutral color scheme. Supporters say it aligns with traditional eating habits and avoids stigmatizing culturally significant foods (Ministero della Salute, n.d.).

Iconic Italian foods with geographical indications (GIs), like Parmigiano Reggiano and Gorgonzola, are penalized under Nutri-Score for their fat or salt content, despite being minimally processed and nutrient-rich. Italian authorities argue the system misleads consumers, undermines GI protections, and overlooks cultural heritage and dietary complexity, threatening emblematic national products (Stiletto et al., 2024).

These concerns were formalized in Bollettino n. 29/2022, a decision by the Italian Competition Authority (Autorità Garante della Concorrenza e del Mercato), an independent public body responsible for enforcing national laws on consumer protection and competition. The Authority found that Nutri-Score oversimplifies nutritional information, fails to reflect individual dietary needs, and risks misleading consumers by disproportionately penalizing traditional foods (Autorità Garante della Concorrenza

e del Mercato, 2022). It classified the use of the Nutri-Score label on food packaging as a potentially unfair commercial practice under Italian consumer law, particularly when applied without adequate explanation of its algorithm or interpretive meaning. Although the decision is not binding at the EU level, it holds legal and political relevance because it provides formal, institutional evidence that a Member State views Nutri-Score as incompatible with its national regulatory framework.

This finding significantly strengthened Italy's opposition to a harmonized FOPNL system by providing a consumer protection rationale rooted in national law. It also complicates EU-level harmonization efforts under Article 35(5) of Regulation (EU) No. 1169/2011, which permits the European Commission to act only when differing national schemes demonstrably impede the internal market and when harmonization is legally feasible across Member States (European Parliament and Council, 2011).

In contrast, countries such as France, Germany, and Belgium support Nutri-Score, citing its value in harmonizing FOPNL systems across Europe, reducing consumer confusion, and promoting fair competition in the internal market (Santé Publique France, 2021). However, some observers note that NutriInform may present interpretation challenges for consumers with lower nutritional literacy and may allow flexibility in how nutrient information is displayed, which could be leveraged by manufacturers to highlight certain attributes (He, Mazzù, & Baccelloni, 2023; Morrison, 2020). While adoption by manufacturers has been relatively limited to date, the Italian government continues to support the system as a scientifically informed and culturally relevant alternative (Deconinck, 2025).

Beyond technical objections to labeling formats, Italy's stance reflects deeper cultural and political priorities. The country's approach includes constitutional amendments that enshrine food sovereignty and protect its culinary heritage, underscoring that food labeling is not solely a regulatory matter but also a question of national identity and autonomy. Italy has also built alliances with Member States such as Greece, Cyprus, Romania, and Latvia, framing its resistance as part of a broader regional effort to defend traditional food cultures against uniform health labeling mandates at the EU level (Politico, 2021).

This conflict highlights a core tension in EU food governance: whether harmonized public health interventions can coexist with the protection of national food cultures in a unified market.

iii. Defending Food Sovereignty Through Constitutional Law

In 2024, Italy proposed a constitutional amendment to safeguard traditional food practices that, if enacted, could serve as a legal basis to challenge the imposition of a harmonized FOPNL system across the EU. As of late May 2025, the amendment has not been enacted, as it remains under parliamentary review and has yet to secure approval from both houses of Italy's Parliament (Senato della Repubblica, 2024). The amendment seeks to enshrine the right to "healthy nutrition" and affirm the principle of food sovereignty within Article 32 of the Italian Constitution (Nikolova, 2024). Article 32 already affirms that "The Republic safeguards health as a fundamental right of the individual and collective interest," offering a foundation for Italy's proposed expansion to include food sovereignty (Constitutional Court of the Italian Republic, 2023). Originally presented in 2024 by Member of Parliament Tommaso Foti, the proposed language states: "The Republic guarantees the healthy nutrition of its citizens. To this end, it pursues the principle of food sovereignty and protects products that symbolize national identity" (Nikolova, 2024).

By embedding food sovereignty into constitutional law, Italy would gain stronger legal grounds to oppose an EU-wide FOPNL mandate like Nutri-Score (Fortuna, 2024). Constitutional status would allow Italy to argue that such measures interfere with national identity and go beyond what the EU is allowed to do under the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality, which are enshrined in Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union (European Union, n.d.). These principles mean that the EU should only act when local or national governments can't achieve the goal on their own (subsidiarity) and that any EU action should be limited to what is truly necessary and nothing more (proportionality).

Key domestic actors, including policymakers, Ferrero, and Coldiretti, have argued that Nutri-Score misrepresents the nutritional value of iconic Italian products and threatens the country's agri-food sector. Ferrero, a

leading exporter, opposes Nutri-Score's negative ratings for culturally significant products like Nutella and Kinder Chocolate, which are high in fat and sugar but typically consumed in small portions. Coldiretti, Italy's main farmers' association, similarly warns that the system stigmatizes traditional foods, despite their nutritional and cultural value (foodwatch, 2024; Dongo, 2021; Wax & Leali, 2022). Together, Ferrero and Coldiretti exemplify the broad coalition backing policies that protect traditional and locally sourced foods from one-size-fits-all EU labeling schemes.

iv. Labeling Fragmentation in the EU: Consumer Confusion and Industry Burdens

The coexistence of Italy's NutrInform Battery and the Nutri-Score system has led to regulatory fragmentation within the EU, complicating efforts to establish a harmonized approach to FOPNL. This fragmentation presents challenges for both consumers and the food industry.

Consumers may face confusion when encountering different labeling schemes across Member States, undermining the public health goals these systems aim to support. For food producers, particularly those engaged in cross-border trade, the lack of uniformity raises compliance costs and complicates market access strategies. Divergent national requirements make it difficult for manufacturers to adopt a single labeling approach. For instance, producers of Prosciutto di Parma, a product protected under the EU's GI system may receive a low Nutri-Score rating in countries applying the scheme due to its natural salt content. A "C" or "D" rating could deter health-conscious consumers, despite the product's artisanal preparation, cultural importance, and well-established role in Mediterranean dietary patterns.

In contrast, the NutrInform Battery, Italy's preferred system, provides a portion-based view of nutritional values and avoids penalizing traditional foods. Under this scheme, Prosciutto di Parma is evaluated within the context of typical consumption patterns, emphasizing its place in a balanced diet rather than focusing solely on individual nutrient thresholds, thereby avoiding unfairly labeling the product as unhealthy.

v. The Future of FOPNL in the EU

At a June 2024 Agriculture and Fisheries Council meeting, the EU Health Commissioner acknowledged that divisions among Member States were blocking progress toward a harmonized FOPNL system. By March 2025, reports confirmed that the European Commission had abandoned efforts to mandate Nutri-Score across the EU, citing the need for more evidence on its effectiveness in encouraging healthier choices (European Parliament, 2025). Consumer groups like Foodwatch criticized the move as a setback for public health and transparency (Deconinck, 2025). As the EU debate stalls, global approaches to FOPNL offer valuable lessons. Despite differences in legal and political systems, international experiences reveal both common trends and varied strategies for tackling UPF consumption, highlighting best practices, potential challenges, and the influence of labeling on consumer behavior and industry reformulation.

VI. Global Front-of-Pack Labeling Systems: Diverging Paths and Emerging Trends

As the EU continues to face challenges in harmonizing its FOPNL strategy, the global landscape remains fragmented, shaped by diverse legal, economic, and health priorities. Outside the EU and Latin America, many countries are adopting hybrid models aligned with local policy goals. While most rely on nutrient-based thresholds, a growing number are beginning to factor in the degree of processing, especially ultra-processing. These labeling systems generally fall into three categories: non-interpretive, interpretive, and semi-interpretive. A fourth, emerging model incorporates processing-based indicators. The following sections explore how countries align with and adapt these approaches.

a. Non-Interpretive Labels: Factual Data Without Evaluation

Non-interpretive labels provide raw nutritional data, such as grams of sugar, fat, sodium, or calories per serving, without indicating whether the

amounts are high or low. Consumers must interpret the health implications on their own. The U.S. exemplifies this model, using the Nutrition Facts Panel and percent daily values without color coding or summary icons. This system is shaped by established regulatory norms in the U.S., strong First Amendment protections, and a history of industry-led initiatives. Although recent proposals like the Childhood Diabetes Reduction Act of 2024 show growing interest in warning labels, the U.S. still favors factual disclosure. China's 2024 draft guidelines also allow for non-interpretive formats, listing nutrient amounts and daily value percentages without interpretive elements (USDA FAS, 2024).

b. Interpretive Labels: Guiding Consumer Choice Through Evaluative Tools

Interpretive FOPNL systems use visual tools, such as warning symbols, color codes, or star ratings, to evaluate a product's healthfulness and guide consumer decision-making. Several Latin American countries have pioneered this approach. Chile, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay, and Argentina have implemented mandatory warning labels for products "high in" sugar, sodium, or saturated fat. These bold symbols, often black octagons, aim to discourage unhealthy food consumption and are often paired with restrictions on marketing to children (UNICEF, 2021). The Philippines is advancing legislation modeled on this approach, while Kenya and South Africa are developing systems using similar shapes like triangles and octagons (UNICEF, 2021).

Israel offers a distinct example with its red warning symbols, implemented in 2020, targeting products high in sugar, sodium, and saturated fat. These are paired with calorie counts and teaspoon-based visuals for sugar (IJHPR, 2021; Ministry of Health, 2017). Despite industry resistance, the government framed the policy as legally and politically viable.

As of May 2025, India's proposed Indian Nutrition Rating (INR) system remains under regulatory review. On April 9, 2025, the Supreme Court of India directed the central government to finalize FOPNL regulations within three months, instructing authorities to incorporate expert recommendations into the long-pending 2022 draft amendment (Supreme

Court of India, 2025). Central to this process is the INR system, which would assign star ratings to packaged foods based on a balance of beneficial and harmful nutrients. While still under consideration, the Court's intervention underscores growing public and institutional pressure for stronger and more transparent food labeling (India Law LLP, 2025).

In Europe, countries like France, Belgium, Germany, and Spain have adopted the Nutri-Score voluntarily (Santé Publique France, 2021). While voluntary, Nutri-Score remains Europe's most influential interpretive system. Outside Europe, Australia and New Zealand use the Health Star Rating, a five-star scale balancing nutrient content, which may become mandatory if uptake stays low (Australian Government Department of Health and Aged Care, n.d.). Abu Dhabi, the capital of the United Arab Emirates (UAE), is set to launch Nutri-Mark in June 2025. Modeled after Nutri-Score but adapted to align with Halal standards, Nutri-Mark will grade packaged foods from "A" (healthiest) to "E" (least healthy) based on a balance of positive and negative nutritional components (Abu Dhabi Public Health Centre, 2024).

c. Semi-Interpretive Labels: Blending Data and Guidance Without Judgment

Semi-interpretive labels offer a compromise between purely factual disclosures and fully evaluative systems. These labels display numerical nutrient information alongside simplified visuals, such as colors or symbols, but stop short of providing a holistic health judgment or summary score. The best-known example is the traffic light label, which uses red, amber, and green to indicate whether a food is high, medium, or low in sugar, salt, or fat (Bin Sunaid et al., 2021).

In 2018, Saudi Arabia's Food and Drug Authority introduced a similar label using blue, yellow, and red. Initially voluntary, plans to mandate the label were abandoned in 2021 after trade objections, particularly from the U.S. (Saudi Food and Drug Authority, 2021; U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2023). The UAE underwent a similar reversal, reclassifying a planned mandatory scheme as voluntary due to concerns over cost and competitiveness (Food Business Africa, 2021).

Indonesia is advancing a semi-interpretive, color-coded labeling system. In 2024, its Food and Drug Authority proposed Nutri-Level, which grades products from A to D based on sugar, salt, and fat content. Ratings of C or D must appear on the front, while A or B are optional. The use of visual cues without an overall health score qualifies it as semi-interpretive (USDA FAS, 2024; Antara News, 2025). China's similar draft regulation reflects the growing appeal of these flexible formats across policy contexts.

d. Emerging Processing-Inclusive Systems: Incorporating Food Structure and Ultra-Processing

While most FOPNL systems still center on nutrient thresholds, a growing wave of regulation is beginning to address food processing, particularly the presence of UPFs. Many initiatives draw on the NOVA classification, which defines UPFs as products made with industrial ingredients like emulsifiers, colorings, and flavorings, additives that enhance taste and shelf life but often reduce nutritional value (Monteiro et al., 2019). France has updated Nutri-Score to account for processing and food structure, while Canada's "high in" labels, though still nutrient-based, frequently capture UPFs by flagging products high in sugar, sodium, and saturated fat.

However, exemptions for nutrient-dense or culturally significant ingredients like plain dairy, eggs, and olive oil introduce complexity. In systems like Nutri-Score, these ingredients can improve a product's score even when used in reformulated or UPFs (Hafner & Pravst, 2024; Kjeldsen & Tetens, 2025). By improving overall scores, these ingredients may obscure the degree of processing in certain products, hindering consumers' ability to identify and avoid UPFs.

Brazil has tested labels stating "Warning: Ultra-Processed" in behavioral studies, signaling potential future policy, though formal adoption has stalled amid trade pressures (D'Angelo Campos et al., 2024). These challenges highlight the political and economic barriers to incorporating processing criteria. Still, debates in both nutrient-based and processing-aware systems reflect growing consensus that processing is an independent factor consumers should recognize.

FOPNL systems are evolving beyond nutrient content. Whether explicitly, as in Brazil, or implicitly, as in France and Canada, incorporating processing indicators marks a new frontier in labeling policy. While implementation varies, there is increasing agreement that food structure, not just composition, is central to disease prevention. In contrast, the U.S. remains an outlier, relying on non-interpretive labels shaped more by legal and commercial concerns than public health priorities.

VII. United States: Divergent Paths in Federal and State Food Labeling Reform

Unlike Mexico, which grounds its labeling policies in the constitutional right to health, and Italy, which invokes cultural sovereignty, the U.S. approaches FOPNL through a commercial speech lens. First Amendment protections and federalism constrain regulatory coherence, resulting in a fragmented legal landscape that limits nationwide implementation of public health measures.

a. Federal Legal Framework and U.S. Food and Drug Administration's Movement Toward Interpretive Labeling

Food labeling in the U.S. is regulated primarily under the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act (NLEA) of 1990, which mandates the standardized Nutrition Facts Panel for most packaged foods (21 U.S.C. § 343, 2024). This back-of-pack label provides quantitative data on calories, fats, sugars, and sodium. However, low levels of nutritional literacy have limited consumer understanding (Persoskie, Hennessy, & Levin, 2017). The NLEA does not require interpretive or FOPNL.

Without federal requirements for interpretive FOPNL, voluntary, industry-led initiatives have emerged to address consumer information needs and showcase corporate responsibility. One such initiative is Facts Up Front, developed by the Grocery Manufacturers Association (now the Consumer Brands Association) and the Food Marketing Institute, both trade associations representing major food and beverage companies. The scheme displays select nutrient information, such as calories, saturated

fat, sodium, and sugars, without using symbols or evaluative scoring (Consumer Brands Association, n.d.). While promoted as informative, critics argue it serves industry marketing goals more than public health interests.

UPFs have become a central concern in U.S. nutrition policy due to links to chronic disease and diet-related disparities. In January 2025, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) proposed a new FOPNL rule that classifies nutrients as “Low,” “Med,” or “High,” based on agency research. While a step toward interpretive labeling, many advocates contend it still falls short (Newman, 2025).

Momentum for reform intensified with the May 2025 release of the *Make America Healthy Again* (MAHA) report, commissioned by President Trump and led by Health and Human Services Secretary Robert F. Kennedy Jr. The report identifies UPFs as a major contributor to chronic illness in American children and calls for stronger national action on labeling and marketing (Make America Healthy Again Commission, 2025).

b. The Absence of a Legal Definition of Ultra-Processed Foods in U.S. Law

Despite growing evidence linking UPFs to health risks, U.S. law still lacks a formal definition of “ultra-processed,” limiting federal regulatory action. A 2023 Congressional Research Service report confirms that neither federal statutes nor FDA regulations define “processed,” “highly processed,” or “ultra-processed” in an enforceable way (Congressional Research Service, 2023). This absence constrains the FDA’s authority to mandate FOPNL, restrict marketing, or issue dietary guidance specifically targeting UPFs.

In place of direct regulation, the FDA uses indirect tools like nutrient thresholds, ingredient disclosures, and additive restrictions. The GRAS (Generally Recognized as Safe) designation allows certain substances in food without premarket approval if considered safe by experts. In 2015, the FDA revoked GRAS status for artificial trans fats, effectively banning partially hydrogenated oils, a step that indirectly targeted UPFs. More recently, the agency proposed bans on synthetic additives like red

dye No. 3, reflecting increased scrutiny of hyper-processed ingredients (FDA, 2023).

While these measures do not define or regulate UPFs as a category, they act as piecemeal efforts to reduce related health harms. The FDA itself has acknowledged this limitation, noting that UPF risks may only be partially addressed through nutrient-specific actions (FDA, 2024, p. 5). Without a formal definition, the agency's ability to address UPFs holistically remains constrained.

c. Political Resistance and Regulatory Limits

The FDA has so far declined to incorporate the term “ultra-processed” into its proposed FOPNL. In 2024, Senator Bernie Sanders urged the agency to adopt warnings similar to tobacco labels, citing the public health risks of UPFs (Inside Health Policy, 2024; Vox, 2024). FDA's hesitation reflects both scientific uncertainty and legal risk. Without statutory backing, any mandate focused on processing would likely face industry pushback and raise First Amendment concerns.

Proposed U.S. legislation aims to address UPF-related health risks through front-of-package warnings on sugar-sweetened beverages, products with non-sugar sweeteners, and UPFs. The Childhood Diabetes Reduction Act of 2024 (S.4195) requires warnings stating: “Food and Drug Administration Warning: Consuming ultra-processed foods and drinks can cause weight gain, which increases the risk of obesity and type-2 diabetes” (Congress.gov, 2024). These warnings must appear on at least 5% of the front label, in bold, with a rectangular border and exclamation point icon. The legislation reflects growing concern over the health impacts of UPFs (Monteiro et al., 2019) and includes provisions to restrict junk food marketing to children. These efforts suggest an emerging federal strategy to address UPFs as a public health issue.

Meanwhile, legal action is beginning to take shape. A coalition of West Virginia law firms has filed lawsuits against major food manufacturers, alleging that UPFs contribute to youth obesity and chronic disease (Lawrence, 2025). These cases may mark a shift toward treating UPFs as both a legal and regulatory concern.

d. State-Level Innovation and First Amendment Litigation

i. Emergence of State-Level UPF Legislation

In the absence of federal action, state governments are increasingly asserting authority over food labeling, particularly in response to concerns about UPFs. In March 2025, the Texas Senate unanimously passed Senate Bill 25, requiring warning labels on foods containing additives or artificial colors banned in the EU, UK, Canada, or Australia. The bill also established the Texas Nutrition Advisory Committee to evaluate research, raise public awareness about UPFs, and propose state-level guidelines (Texas Legislature, 2025). Louisiana followed with Senate Bill 14, introduced in March 2025, which proposes labeling requirements for products with dozens of internationally banned ingredients and seeks to prohibit UPFs in public school meals. These initiatives reflect a growing appetite in state legislatures for stronger, more localized food regulation.

ii. California's Proactive Role

California has taken an especially aggressive stance. In March 2025, Assemblymember Jesse Gabriel introduced Assembly Bill 1264, which aims to eliminate the most harmful UPFs from school meals by 2032. The same week, Governor Gavin Newsom issued an executive order initiating a comprehensive state-level investigation into the health impacts of UPFs and synthetic food dyes (Office of Governor Gavin Newsom, 2025). These developments reaffirm California's history of public health leadership and its willingness to act when federal regulation stalls.

iii. First Amendment Challenges to Labeling Laws

State efforts to mandate food warnings face significant constitutional scrutiny under the First Amendment. When governments compel commercial entities to disclose information, courts often apply the standard from *Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel*, 471 U.S. 626 (1985), which permits mandatory disclosures of purely factual, noncontrover-

sial information reasonably related to a substantial government interest and not unduly burdensome (Fowler, 2019; *Milavetz v. United States*, 2010). However, *Zauderer* does not apply to disclosures deemed ideological or controversial. In *NIFLA v. Becerra*, 138 S. Ct. 2361 (2018), the Supreme Court struck down a California law requiring speech on a contested moral and political issue, ruling it fell outside *Zauderer*'s scope because it was found to be controversial and not a purely factual, noncontroversial disclosure.

This distinction is critical for FOPNL. Numeric disclosures like calories or grams of sugar generally qualify as factual under *Zauderer*; however, interpretive systems, such as Nutri-Score or red octagon warnings, may be seen as subjective, especially when they assign negative scores to culturally significant foods like Parmigiano Reggiano or prosciutto based on salt or fat content (He, Mazzù, & Baccelloni, 2023; Banderali et al., 2021). Critics argue such systems oversimplify nutrition science and risk misleading consumers about dietary context (Scrinis & Parker, 2016). Whether a label informs or implicitly urges behavioral change often determines the applicable legal standard and how courts assess its constitutionality.

iv. Judicial Precedent and Future Outlook

Judicial outcomes under *Zauderer* have varied. For example, in *American Beverage Association v. City and County of San Francisco*, 916 F.3d 749 (9th Cir. 2019), the Ninth Circuit struck down a sugar-sweetened beverage warning as excessively burdensome. Similarly, other courts have found disclosure mandates unlawful: the D.C. Circuit invalidated FDA's cigarette warnings in 2012, and a Texas court rejected a revised version in 2022. However, in 2023, the Fifth Circuit upheld a later iteration, finding it complied with *Zauderer* and did not unduly interfere with commercial speech (*R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. FDA*, 65 F.4th 182, 5th Cir. 2023). The Supreme Court's 2024 denial of certiorari let that ruling stand. These precedents suggest future FOPNL laws, especially those targeting UPFs, will face constitutional challenges. Still, if state regulations are narrowly tailored, evidence-based, and minimally burdensome, they may survive judicial review.

e. International Trade Risks of State-Led Labeling Laws

State-level food labeling laws aimed at UPFs can raise both constitutional and international trade concerns. When these regulations diverge from global benchmarks, such as those established by the *Codex Alimentarius*, or appear to unfairly disadvantage imported products, they may come under scrutiny through international trade frameworks like the WTO's *Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement* or the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (WTO, 2023; USTR, 2020). A clear example is Mexico's mandatory FOPNL system, which prompted formal complaints from the U.S. This trading partner argued that the warning labels constituted non-tariff trade barriers; in other words, they created obstacles for foreign companies to sell their products in the market without imposing an outright ban (Bahri, 2021; Esposito, 2020). If similar U.S. state laws are seen as discriminatory or overly burdensome to foreign goods, the federal government could become the target of trade disputes or retaliatory actions by other countries. Potential consequences include formal cases before international trade bodies, economic sanctions, or diplomatic pressure to modify or repeal the contested regulations (Crosbie, Carriedo, and Schmidt, 2022).

VIII. Conclusion

FOPNL has evolved from a voluntary tool into a key legal and policy instrument for promoting transparency and informed consumer choices. It now influences product formulation, regulatory debates, and broader issues at the intersection of trade, culture, and public health. National approaches vary, shaped by legal systems, cultural values, and policy goals. The cases of Mexico, Italy, and the U.S. show how domestic contexts shape FOPNL and underscore shared challenges, such as balancing health goals with speech protections and trade obligations. As UPFs proliferate globally, attention has shifted from whether to regulate to how best to address processing-related factors in labeling. Incorporating such criteria signals a move beyond nutrient thresholds, pushing governments to adopt new legal and scientific tools. Jurisdictions that

delay engagement may face pressure to align with evolving norms and consumer expectations. To remain effective, FOPNL systems must be flexible, evidence-based, and responsive to diverse legal and cultural environments.

Bibliographic References

- 21 U.S.C. § 343 (2024).
- Abu Dhabi Quality and Conformity Council. (2024, November 26). *ADQCC & ADPHC announces Nutri-Mark at ADIFE 2024*.
- American Beverage Ass’n v. City and County of San Francisco*, 916 F.3d 749 (9th Cir. 2019).
- Associated Press. (2020, March 26). Dile adiós al Osito Bimbo y Chester Chetos: Esta es la razón. *My San Antonio*. <https://www.mysanantonio.com/noticias/article/dile-adios-osito-bimbo-15157612.php>
- Australian Government Department of Health and Aged Care. (n.d.). *Health Star Rating system*. <https://www.healthstarrating.gov.au>
- Bahri, A. (2021). The Mexican front-of-pack labeling reform: Is it compatible with international trade law? *Journal of World Investment & Trade*, 22(2), 223–256. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22119000-12340212>
- Baker, P., Machado, P., Santos, T., Sievert, K., Backholer, K., Hadjikakou, M., Russell, C., Huse, O., Bell, C., Scrinis, G., Worsley, A., Friel, S., & Lawrence, M. (2020). Ultra-processed foods and the nutrition transition: Global, regional and national trends, food systems transformations and political economy drivers. *Obesity Reviews*, 21(12), e13126. <https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.13126>
- Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile. (2012). *Ley N° 20.606 sobre composición nutricional de los alimentos y su publicidad*. <https://www.bcn.cl/leychile/navegar?idNorma=1041570>
- Bin Sunaid, F. F., Al-Jawaldeh, A., Almutairi, M. W., Alobaid, R. A., Alfuraih, T. M., Bensaidan, F. N., Alragea, A. S., Almutairi, L. A., Duhaime, A. F., Alsloom, T. A., & Jabbour, J. (2021). Saudi Arabia’s healthy food strategy: Progress & hurdles in the 2030 road. *Nutrients*, 13(7), 2130. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu13072130>
- Borrillo, M. (2021, November 15). *Nutri-score, patatine fritte più*

- salutari dell'olio*. Patuanelli: Italia contraria. Corriere della Sera. https://www.corriere.it/salute/nutrizione/21_novembre_15/nutri-score-patatine-fritte-piu-salutari-dell-olio-patuanelli-italia-contraria-f7d3e4a4-45cf-11ec-a557-3a40d504ba72.shtml
- Camera dei Deputati. (2021, November 10). *Allegato A ai resoconti – Seduta n. 592 del 10 novembre 2021*. <https://www.camera.it/leg18/410?idSeduta=0592&tipo=stenografico#sed0592.stenografico.tit00030>
- Center for Science in the Public Interest. (2023, January 10). *Front-of-package nutrition labeling: Leveraging food labels to inform consumers and promote public health*. <https://www.cspinet.org/resource/front-package-nutrition-labeling-leveraging-food-labels-inform-consumers-and-promote>
- Codex Alimentarius Commission. (2021). *Codex Alimentarius: International food standards*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations & World Health Organization. <https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/home/en/>
- Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment. (2022, October 19). *Children's cereal company v. Mexico: Corporate use of investor-state dispute settlement to influence nutrition policy*. <https://ccsi.columbia.edu/news/childrens-cereal-company-v-mexico>
- Congreso de la República del Perú. (2013). *Ley N° 30021, Ley de promoción de la alimentación saludable para niños, niñas y adolescentes*. <https://busquedas.elperuano.pe/normaslegales/ley-de-promocion-de-la-alimentacion-saludable-para-ninos-ley-n-30021-905946-1/>
- Congreso General de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos. (2008). *Ley General para el Control del Tabaco*. *Diario Oficial de la Federación*. https://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5029259&fecha=30/05/2008
- Congressional Research Service. (2023, October 26). *NOVA food classification system and U.S. food policy (IF12826)*. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF12826>
- Constitutional Court of the Italian Republic. (2023, October). *Constitution of the Italian Republic* (English version). https://www.cortecostituzionale.it/documenti/download/doc/repository/pdf/Costituzione_inglese

pdf

Consumer Brands Association. (n.d.). *Facts Up Front*. <https://www.factsupfront.org>

Crosbie, E., Carriedo, A., & Schmidt, L. (2022). Hollow threats: Transnational food and beverage companies' use of international agreements to fight front-of-pack nutrition labeling in Mexico and beyond. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 11(6), 722–732. <https://doi.org/10.34172/ijhpm.2020.241>

Deconinck, C. (2025, 3 marzo). *Leaked documents: 'Italians torpedo EC's plans to implement EU-wide nutrition labelling'*. Brussels Signal.

Dongo, D. (2021, July 16). *Nutri-Score, Ferrero and Coldiretti vs. everyone*. FoodTimes.

D'Angelo Campos, A., Ng, S. W., Duran, A. C., Khandpur, N., Taillie, L. S., Christon, F. O., & Hall, M. G. (2024). "Warning: ultra-processed": An online experiment examining the impact of ultra-processed warning labels on consumers' product perceptions and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 21(1), 115. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-024-01547-6>

Ertl, N., Vieux, F., & Mathiot, G. (2020). Nutrition-oriented reformulation of extruded cereals and associated environmental footprint: A case study. *Foods*, 9(9), 1260. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods9091260>

Esposito, A. (2020, August 12). *Mexico's new warning labels on junk food meet supersized opposition from U.S., EU*. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com/article/world/mexicos-new-warning-labels-on-junk-food-meet-supersized-opposition-from-us-e-idUSKCN25808U>

European Commission. (n.d.). *Proposal for a revision of Regulation on food information to consumers (FIC)*. https://health.ec.europa.eu/publications/proposal-revision-regulation-food-information-consumers-fic_en

European Court of Auditors. (2024). *Food labelling: EU protection of consumers and free movement of goods still not fully ensured* (Special Report No. 23). <https://www.eca.europa.eu/en/publications/Pages/food-labelling.aspx>

European Parliament and Council. (2011). Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011

- on the provision of food information to consumers. *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 304, 18–63. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2011/1169/oj>
- European Parliament. (2025, March 20). *Proposal for a harmonised mandatory front-of-pack nutrition labelling*. <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20250320IPR97217/proposal-harmonised-eu-labels>
- European Parliamentary Research Service. (2020). *Nutrition labelling schemes used in Member States* (Briefing No. PE 652.028). European Parliament. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2020/652028/EPRS_BRI\(2020\)652028_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2020/652028/EPRS_BRI(2020)652028_EN.pdf)
- European Union. (n.d.). *Subsidiarity and proportionality*. *EUR-Lex*. Retrieved May 28, 2025, from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=legisum:ai0017>
- Food and Drug Administration. (2025, January 16). Food labeling: Front-of-package nutrition information. *Federal Register*, 90(11), 5426–5463. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/01/16/2025-00752/food-labeling-front-of-package-nutrition-information>
- Food Business Africa. (2021, December 13). *UAE amends nutritional labelling requirements from mandatory to voluntary*. <https://www.foodbusinessafrica.com/uae-amends-nutritional-labelling-requirements-from-mandatory-to-voluntary/>
- Food Marketing Institute. (2025, January 14). *FMI statement on FDA proposed rule on front-of-package labeling*. <https://www.fmi.org/newsroom/news-archive/view/2025/01/14/fmi-statement-on-fda-proposed-rule-on-front-of-package-labeling>
- Foodwatch. (2024, June 17). *Strategies used by the agro-industrial lobby against a mandatory Nutri-Score*. foodwatch. <https://www.foodwatch.org/en/newsroom/2024/strategies-used-against-nutri-score>
- Fortuna, G. (2024, May 3). *Italy to challenge Nutri-Score with constitution*. Euronews. <https://www.euronews.com/green/2024/05/03/italy-to-challenge-nutri-score-with-constitution>
- Fowler, L. (2019). The “uncontroversial” controversy in compelled commercial disclosures. *Fordham Law Review*, 87(4), 1651–1692. <https://>

- ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol87/iss4/4
- Galan, P., Kesse-Guyot, E., Touvier, M., Deschasaux, M., Srouf, B., Chazelas, E., Baudry, J., Fialon, M., Julia, C., & Hercberg, S. (2020, November 7). Nutri-Score and Ultra-Processing: Two Dimensions, Complementary and Not Contradictory. *Nutri-Score Blog*. <https://nutriscore.blog/2020/11/07/nutri-score-ultra-processing/>
- Garduño, S. (2024, October 2). *Claudia Sheinbaum charts a new direction for Mexico's healthcare*. Mexico Business News. <https://mexicobusiness.news/health/news/claudia-sheinbaum-charts-new-direction-mexicos-healthcare>
- Global Health Advocacy Incubator. (2024, May 13). *The Mexican Supreme Court of Justice confirmed the constitutionality of front-of-package warning labeling regulations*. <https://advocacyincubator.org/news/2024/mexico-supreme-court-upholds-warning-labels>
- Gobierno de México. (2020). Modificación a la Norma Oficial Mexicana NOM-051-SCFI/SSA1-2010. *Diario Oficial de la Federación*. https://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5599639&fecha=27/03/2020
- Hafner, E., & Pravst, I. (2024). A systematic assessment of the revised NutriScore algorithm: Potentials for the implementation of front-of-package nutrition labeling across Europe. *Food Frontiers*, 5(3), 947–963. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fft2.2024>
- Haynes, B. (2020, August 12). *Mexico's new warning labels on junk food meet supersized opposition from U.S. groups*. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com/article/world/mexico-food-labels-us-idUSKCN25808U>
- He, J., Mazzù, M. F., & Baccelloni, A. (2023). A 20-country comparative assessment of the effectiveness of Nutri-Score vs. NutriInform Battery front-of-pack nutritional labels on consumer subjective understanding and liking. *Nutrients*, 15(13), 2852. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu15132852>
- Health Canada. (2022, June 30). *Front-of-package nutrition labelling: Regulations*. <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/food-labelling/changes-front-of-package.html>
- Holguín, M. E. (2023, February 4). Arreciarán amparos contra ley anti-tabaco durante los próximos días en La Laguna. *El Siglo de Torreón*.

- <https://www.elsiglodetorreon.com.mx/noticia/2023/arreciaran-amparos-contraleya-antitabaco.html>
- House Appropriations Committee. (2023). *Report to accompany H.R. 4368, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2024*. <https://appropriations.house.gov>
- IJHPR. (2021). The Israeli food labelling reform. *Israel Journal of Health Policy Research*, 10, Article 24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13584-021-00470-7>
- India Law LLP. (2025). *Supreme Court directs government to implement front-of-pack food labels*. <https://www.indialaw.in/news/supreme-court-orders-fopl-implementation/>
- Italian Institute for Planetary Health. (n.d.). *Nutri-Score, il nuovo sistema di etichettatura verso scelte più salutari*. Retrieved May 18, 2025, from <https://www.iiph.it/nutri-score>
- Kjeldsen, C. L., & Tetens, I. (2025). Improvements to the Nutri-Score to address challenges identified in a Nordic setting. *Food & Nutrition Research*, 69, Article 10914. <https://doi.org/10.29219/fnr.v69.10914>
- LaNutrition.fr. (2022, October 17). *NO to the Nutri-Score in Europe!* <https://www.lanutrition.fr/les-news/non-au-nutri-score-en-europe>
- Lawrence, B. (2025, May 23). *Two West Virginia legal firms team up to pursue lawsuits against ultra-processed food manufacturers amid a significant rise of type 2 diabetes*. WOAY. <https://woay.com/wv-firms-sue-upf-makers/>
- Lustig, R. H. (2020). *Metabological: The lure and the lies of processed food, nutrition, and modern medicine*. HarperWave.
- Make America Healthy Again Commission. (2025, May 22). *Make our children healthy again: Assessment report*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. <https://www.hhs.gov/make-america-healthy-again>
- Martínez, K. (2021, February 23). *Cartoon mascots banned from food packaging in Mexico to combat childhood obesity*. Remezcla. <https://remezcla.com/culture/cartoon-mascots-food-packaging-mexico-obesity/>

- Medrano, C., da Costa Louzada, M. L., et al. (2024). *Evaluating front-of-package nutrient profiling systems across Canada, PAHO, and Chile: Implications for ultra-processed food regulation*. medRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.22.24111987>
- Melillo, M. (2023, October 3). *Is it time to rethink regulations on ultra-processed foods?* Think Global Health. <https://www.thinkglobal-health.org/article/it-time-rethink-regulations-ultra-processed-foods>
- Ministerio de Salud Pública de Uruguay. (2018). *Decreto N° 272/018 sobre etiquetado frontal de alimentos*. <https://www.gub.uy/ministerio-salud-publica/comunicacion/noticias/etiquetado-frontal-obligatorio-decreto-n272018>
- Ministerio de Sanidad, Consumo y Bienestar Social. (2019, November 12). *Implantación en España del etiquetado nutricional frontal* [Nota de prensa]. Gobierno de España. <https://www.sanidad.gob.es/etiquetadoFrontal.htm>
- Ministero della Salute. (n.d.). *NutriInform Battery: Sistema di etichettatura nutrizionale volontaria*. https://www.salute.gov.it/imgs/C_17_opuscoliPoster_511_allegato.pdf
- Ministry of Health Singapore. (2023, December 29). *Implementation of Nutri-Grade requirements for freshly prepared beverages from 30 December 2023*. <https://www.hpb.gov.sg/article/nutri-grade-requirements-2023>
- Ministry of Health. (2017). Public Health (Food) (Nutritional Labelling) Regulations, 2017. <https://www.moh.gov.sg>
- Ministère des Solidarités et de la Santé. (2021, July 26). *Nutri-Score: Follow-up report 3 years after the implementation of the logo*. Government of France. <https://solidarites-sante.gouv.fr>
- Monteiro, C. A., Cannon, G., Levy, R. B., Moubarac, J.-C., Louzada, M. L., Rauber, F., Khandpur, N., Cediel, G., Neri, D., Martinez-Steele, E., Baraldi, L. G., & Jaime, P. C. (2019). Ultra-processed foods: What they are and how to identify them. *Public Health Nutrition*, 21(1), 36–45. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980018003762>
- Mortoray, E. (2023, May 12). *How Nestlé sugar balls get a Nutri-Score A. Medium*. <https://medium.com/@edward.mortoray/how-nestle-sugar-balls-get-a-nutri-score-a-f2ea7340db1d>

- NCD Alliance. (2023). *Mexico's junk food bans*. <https://ncdalliance.org/news-events/news/mexicos-junk-food-bans>
- Newman, J. (2025, January 14). The FDA wants to put warning labels on the front of food packages. *The Wall Street Journal*. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/fda-wants-warning-labels-on-food-5ff5c2b9>
- Nikolova, M. (2024, May 8). Nutri-Score creator accuses Italian government of “gastro-populism” in food sovereignty dispute. *FoodIngredientsFirst*. <https://www.foodingredientsfirst.com/news/nutri-score-creator-accuses-italian-government-of-gastro-populism-in-food-sovereignty-dispute.html>
- Nueva Walmart de México v. Mexico, Complaint I-b 33/2023 (Fourth Collegiate Court in Administrative Matters of the First Circuit, Jan. 27, 2023). <https://jusmundi.com/en/document/decision/en-nueva-walmart-de-mexico-v-united-mexican-states-judgment-thursday-27th-january-2023>
- Office of Governor Gavin Newsom. (2025, January 3). *Governor Newsom issues executive order to crack down on ultra-processed foods*. <https://www.gov.ca.gov/2025/01/03/executive-order-upf-labels/>
- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2020, July). *Statement by the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to health on the adoption of front-of-package warning labels*. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/statements/2020/07/statement-un-special-rapporteur-right-health-adoption-front-package-warning>
- Pan American Health Organization. (n.d.). *Front-of-package labeling*. <https://www.paho.org/en/topics/front-package-labeling>
- Persoskie, A., Hennessy, E., & Levin, D. G. (2017). U.S. consumers' understanding of nutrition labels in 2013: The importance of health literacy. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 14, E86. <https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd14.170066>
- Poder Ejecutivo Federal. (2009). Reglamento de la Ley General para el Control del Tabaco. *Diario Oficial de la Federación*. https://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5071874&fecha=31/05/2009
- Politico. (2021, February 4). *Italy collects allies in food label fight*. <https://www.politico.eu/article/italy-food-label-allies-european-union/>
- Pomeranz, J. L. (2024, October 31). *The global challenge of unheal-*

- thy diets: Front-of-package labeling for America*. The Petrie-Flom Center at Harvard Law School. <https://blog.petrieflom.law.harvard.edu/2024/10/31/fopnl-america/>
- Popkin, B. M., Barquera, S., Corvalán, C., Hofman, K. J., Monteiro, C., Ng, S. W., Swart, E. C., & Taillie, L. S. (2021). Towards unified and impactful policies to reduce ultra-processed food consumption and promote healthier eating. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*, 9(7), 462–470. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587\(21\)00140-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(21)00140-3)
- R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. FDA*, 65 F.4th 182 (5th Cir. 2023).
- R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. FDA*, 696 F.3d 1205 (D.C. Cir. 2012).
- R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. FDA*, No. 6:20-cv-00176, 2022 WL 17489170 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 7, 2022).
- R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. FDA*, U.S. Supreme Court Docket No. 23-1008 (May 20, 2024).
- Ramírez Espinosa, L. J., Méndez Quiroz, A., & Morales Flores, A. L. (2023). *Comida chatarra en las escuelas: Datos para Oaxaca*. Centro de Estudios Sociales y de Opinión Pública del H. Congreso del Estado Libre y Soberano de Oaxaca.
- Revill, J. (2019, November 27). *Nestlé to use Nutri-Score nutrition-labeling in Europe*. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-nestle-labeling-idUSKBN1Y10PZ>
- Reyes, A., & Rainer, N. (2021, February 2). *Could Mexico's new warning labels trigger labeling laws elsewhere?* Packaging Digest. <https://www.packagingdigest.com/labeling/could-mexicos-new-warning-labels-trigger-labeling-laws-elsewhere>
- Santé publique France. (2021, July 26). *Nutri-Score: Follow-up report 3 years*. Ministère des Solidarités et de la Santé.
- Santé publique France. (n.d.). *Nutri-Score*. <https://www.santepublique-france.fr/Nutri-Score>
- Scientific Committee of the Nutri-Score. (2023). *Update of the Nutri-Score algorithm for beverages: Second update report*.
- Secretaría de Salud. (2024, April 3). *Secretaría de Salud reconoce decisión de SCJN a favor del etiquetado de advertencia en alimentos y bebidas no alcohólicas*. Gobierno de México. <https://www.gob.mx/salud/prensa/083-secretaria-de-salud-reconoce-decision-de-scjn-a-fa>

vor-del-etiquetado-de-advertencia

- Senato della Repubblica. (2024). *Disegno di legge C. 1881: Modifica all'articolo 32 della Costituzione in materia di sana alimentazione e di sovranità alimentare*. <https://www.senato.it/export/dcl/full/58261?leg=19>
- Southey, F. (2024, February 19). *Nutri-Score and NOVA: Linking nutritional composition to ultra-processing*. FoodNavigator. <https://www.foodnavigator.com/Article/2024/02/19/Nutri-Score-and-NOVA-Linking-nutritional-composition-to-ultra-processing>
- Stiletto, A., Cembalo, L., & Trestini, S. (2024). All that glitters is not gold: The impact of the Nutri-score label on food with geographical indication. *Agricultural and Food Economics*, 12(1), Article 45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40100-024-00267-y>
- Storcksdieck genannt Bonsmann, S., Marandola, G., Ciriolo, E., van Bavel, R., & Wollgast, J. (2020). Front-of-pack nutrition labelling schemes: A comprehensive review (EUR 29811 EN). *Publications Office of the European Union*. <https://doi.org/10.2760/436998>
- Suprema Corte de Justicia de la Nación. (2024, April 3). *Primera Sala valida constitucionalidad de normas sobre etiquetado frontal de advertencia en alimentos y bebidas*. <https://www.internet.scjn.gob.mx>
- Supreme Court of India. (2025). Order dated April 9, 2025, in *Writ Petition* (Civil) No. 437/2024.
- Sánchez-Sánchez, E., García-Vigara, A., García-Pérez, M. Á., Tarín, J. J., & Cano, A. (2022). Ultra-processed foods in university students: Implementing Nutri-Score to make healthy choices. *Healthcare*, 10(5), 984. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare10050984>
- Taillie, L. S., Hall, M. G., Popkin, B. M., Ng, S. W., & Murukutla, N. (2020). Experimental studies of front-of-package nutrient warning labels on sugar-sweetened beverages and ultra-processed foods: A scoping review. *Nutrients*, 12(2), 569. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu12020569>
- Taillie, L. S., Reyes, M., Colchero, M. A., Popkin, B., & Corvalán, C. (2020). An evaluation of Chile's Law of Food Labeling and Advertising on sugar-sweetened beverage purchases from 2015 to 2017: A before-and-after study. *PLOS Medicine*, 17(2), e1003015. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003015>

- The National Law Review*. (2020, October 16). Mexico allows food and beverage companies to use provisional stickers to comply with NOM-051 labeling rules.
- The National Law Review*. (2024, August 15). China releases draft guidelines on front-of-pack nutrition labeling.
- The National Law Review*. (2024, May 7). Health Canada launches FOP labeling awareness initiative.
- U.S. Chamber of Commerce. (2025, March 12). *U.S. Chamber of Commerce comments on unfair trade practices and non-reciprocal trade arrangements* (Federal Register Docket No. USTR-2025-0001).
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2023, March 6). *FAIRS Annual Country Report: Saudi Arabia* (Report No. SA2023-0004). Foreign Agricultural Service.
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2023). *FDA takes steps to address certain food additives and ingredients*.
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2024). *FDA perspectives on ultra-processed foods and public health*.
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2025, May 8). *Front-of-package nutrition labeling*.
- UNICEF. (2021). *Experiences in the design and implementation of front-of-pack nutrition warning labels in Latin America and the Caribbean*.
- UNICEF. (2021). *Front-of-pack nutrition labelling of foods and beverages: Policy brief*.
- UNICEF. (2022). *Front-of-package labelling: Regional experiences to promote healthy eating in Latin America and the Caribbean*.
- United Nations Children's Fund. (2023). *Front-of-pack nutrition labelling policy brief*.
- United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2020, July 9). *Statement by the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to health on the adoption of front-of-pack nutrition labelling*.
- University of California, Davis. (2024). *Ask the Experts: Ultra-Processed Foods and how do they impact our health?*
- USDA Foreign Agricultural Service. (2024, November 27). *Indonesia: Indonesia plans to implement labeling requirements and to restrict sugar, salt, and fat content in processed food and beverages*.

- USDA Foreign Agricultural Service. (2025, April 14). *China: Nutritional labeling standards for prepackaged food finalized*.
- Vargas-Meza, J., Jáuregui, A., Contreras-Manzano, A., Nieto, C., & Barquera, S. (2022). Perception and understanding of Guideline Daily Amount and warning labels among Mexican adults. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(17), 10795. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191710795>
- Wanat, Z., & Leali, G. (2020, December 3). *Italy collects allies in food label fight*. Politico. <https://www.politico.eu/article/italy-food-label-allies-european-union/>
- Wax, E., & Leali, G. (2022, January 3). *Italy claims it's winning the war against French food labels*. Politico. <https://www.politico.eu/article/italy-claims-its-winning-the-war-against-french-food-labels/>
- World Health Organization Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. (2024, March 19). *Court upholds Mexico's strict tobacco control law*.
- World Health Organization. (2022). *Front-of-pack nutrition labelling: Guiding principles and framework manual for country implementation*.
- World Health Organization. (2022). *Noncommunicable diseases*.
- World Trade Organization. (2020). *The WTO and the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission*.
- World Trade Organization. (n.d.). *Technical barriers to trade*.
- WV News Staff. (2024, May 21). *West Virginia law firms file lawsuits targeting processed food manufacturers amid rising youth health crisis*. WVNews. https://www.wvnews.com/news/west-virginia-law-firms-sue-ultra-processed-food/article_20240521.html
- Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel, 471 U.S. 626 (1985); Fowler, 2019.

Contemporary Legal Relationships within the International Context.

Se terminó de editar en febrero de 2026

en los talleres de Astra Ediciones

Av. Acueducto No. 829

Colonia Santa Margarita, C. P. 45140

Zapopan, Jalisco, México.

33 38 34 82 36

E-mail: edicion@astraeditorial.com.mx

www.astraeditorialshop.com

This book is the result of a fruitful dialogue between legal cultures, generations, and human perspectives. It was born of the collaboration between the Universidad de Guadalajara Centro Universitario de Tonalá (University of Guadalajara's Tonalá University Center) and a group of jurists and scholars from the United States, united by a shared conviction: that the Law, to fulfill its highest purpose, must be a living science, in motion, capable of adapting to the challenges of technology, social justice, and human dignity.

ISBN: 978-607-8964-36-9



9 786078 196436 9



Consulta y descarga

