ENVIRONMENTAL LAW
Lewis & Clark Law School

VOLUME 54 FALL 2024 NUMBER 3

ARTICLES

We will be unable to achieve the temperature goals of the Paris Agreement without radically reforming our food systems. Despite animal agriculture's significant responsibility for climate change—emitting the majority of agricultural greenhouse gases (GHGs), likely 15% or more of all human-caused GHGs, around a third of anthropogenic methane and more than half of nitrous oxide (two climate super-pollutants)—policymakers have so far largely failed to reign in its emissions. In recent years, international bodies including the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, U.N. Environment Programme, World Health Organization, and World Bank have begun to explicitly make the connection between animal agriculture's outsized emissions and the need to reduce consumption of animal products, especially in high-income, high-consuming countries. While national-level policy in the United States has not yet embraced these recommendations, policymakers in other countries—led by Europe—are experimenting with policies that would change diets and ultimately "shrink the herd," i.e., reduce the number of animals raised for food. Recent farmer protests and weakening of policy proposals in Europe illustrate the political realities of seeking reform in this area. But sooner government action would enable better outcomes, before the climate crisis forces changes to food systems. Developing effective and lasting policy on climate and animal agriculture will require consensus building, incremental approaches, attention to international equity, and a commitment to a just transition.

Industrial animal agriculture pitches biogas and methane digesters as solutions to the outsized methane footprint of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), yet these efforts merely seek to convey to the public that CAFOs' operations are environmentally responsible. In reality, quite the opposite is true because biogas and methane digesters more deeply

transboundary environmental, health, or social harms. Countries have worked together to protect the ozone layer, combat tobacco addiction, prevent forced labor, prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, prevent the torture of enemy combatants, and more. While there are many relevant differences between the products and processes targeted in these precedents and those of industrial animal agriculture, there are many relevant similarities as well. By exploring precedents and instruments drawn from existing international law, this paper will proffer the idea that a global ban on industrial animal agriculture is both possible and necessary to achieve alongside other global environmental, health, and social targets. We start by defining "industrial animal agriculture" and describing our proposed global ban in general terms. We then survey the environmental, health, and social harms of industrial animal agriculture in both its intensive form and its extensive form, and we argue that governments have a responsibility to work together to ban this food system by 2050. We then survey legal precedents for such a global ban, noting other cases where governments have pursued international regulation—including bans—of products or processes that cause similar kinds of harm. We close by proposing a pathway towards a global ban by 2050, which proceeds via informational, financial, regulatory, and just transition policies that seek to gradually scale down industrial animal agriculture, gradually scale up alternative food systems, and support everyone as much as possible along the way.