

WEEKLY NEWS ARTICLE UPDATE



Prepared by John C. Baize and Associates | 7319 Brad Street | Falls Church, VA 22042
TEL: 703-698-5908 | FAX: 703-698-7109 | E-mail: jbaize@attglobal.net

August 22, 2016

Articles in This Edition

- [Export Sales Highlights](#)
- [USDA Updates Farmer-Reported U.S Crop Planting Totals for August](#)
- [Floods: Argentina's Cordoba Province Could Be Unseeded in the Next Campaign a Million Hectares](#)
- [U.S. July Soybean Crush Falls Below Expectations - NOPA](#)
- [Cargill, Louis Dreyfus Halt Brazil Soy Plants as Margins Vanish](#)
- [Long-Term Study Links Neonicotinoids to Wild Bee Declines](#)
- [Indian Refiners Switch to Soyoil as Palm Prices Rally](#)
- [New Zealand EPA Declares Glyphosate as Noncarcinogenic](#)
- [Americans Should Eat Less Meat, but They're Eating More and More](#)

Export Sales Highlights

This summary is based on reports from exporters for the period August 5-11, 2016.

Soybeans: Net sales of 177,900 MT for 2015/2016 were down 26 percent from the previous week and 29 percent from the prior 4-week average. Increases were for China (337,400 MT, including 312,000 MT switched from unknown destinations), the Netherlands (154,000 MT, including 140,000 MT switched from unknown destinations), Germany (66,600 MT), Indonesia (32,900 MT), and Malaysia (25,900 MT, including 24,000 MT switched from unknown destinations). Reductions were reported for unknown destinations (494,700 MT). For 2016/2017, net sales of 1,597,900 MT were reported primarily for unknown destinations (827,000 MT), China (694,200 MT), Taiwan (34,000 MT), and Mexico (10,900 MT). Exports of 865,100 MT were down 14 percent from the previous week, but up 27 percent from the prior 4-week average. The primary destinations were China (404,000 MT), the Netherlands (154,000 MT), Germany (66,600 MT), Malaysia (34,000 MT), and Canada (30,900 MT).

Optional Origin Sales: For 2015/2016, the current optional origin outstanding sales balance is 423,000 MT, all China. For 2016/2017, the current outstanding balance is 63,000 MT, all China.

Exports for Own Account: The current exports for own account outstanding balance totals 500 MT, all Canada.

Exports Adjustments: Accumulated exports to the Netherlands were adjusted down 66,610 MT for week ending August 4th. The correct destination is Germany and is included in this week's report.

Soybean Cake and Meal: Net sales of 121,400 MT for 2015/2016 were up noticeably from the previous week and up 38 percent from the prior 4-week average. Increases were reported for unknown destinations (57,900 MT), Mexico (19,000 MT), Ecuador (9,000 MT), the Dominican Republic (5,800 MT), and Costa Rica (5,000 MT, including 5,200 MT switched from unknown destinations and decreases of 2,000 MT). For 2016/2017, net sales of 191,800 MT were reported for the Philippines (84,500 MT), Mexico (72,100 MT), the Dominican Republic (27,400 MT), Canada (6,300 MT), and Bangladesh (1,500 MT). Exports of 135,700 MT were up 71 percent from the previous week, but down 23 percent from the prior 4-week average. The primary destinations were Mexico (34,200 MT), Thailand (20,000 MT), Peru (16,400 MT), Canada (14,000 MT), and Honduras (10,600 MT).

Optional Origin Sales: For 2015/2016, the current optional origin outstanding sales balance is 36,000 MT, all unknown destinations.

Soybean Oil: Net sales of 3,900 MT for 2015/2016 were down 66 percent from the previous week and 70 percent from the prior 4-week average. Increases were reported for Mexico (3,300 MT), Canada (500 MT), and Trinidad (100 MT). Exports of 6,000 MT were down 71 percent from the previous week and 77 percent from the prior 4-week average. The primary destinations were Mexico (5,400 MT) and Canada (500 MT).

[USDA Updates Farmer-Reported U.S Crop Planting Totals for August](#)

WASHINGTON, Aug 12 (Reuters) - Farmers who participated in U.S. crop subsidy programs reported "prevented plantings" for Aug. 1, 2016 of 1.039 million acres of corn, 0.237 million acres of soybeans, 1.780 million acres of wheat, the Department of Agriculture said on Friday.

Producers enrolled in subsidy programs for Aug. 1, 2016 reported planted acreage, including failed acres, at 90.365 million of corn, 81.368 million of soybeans and 47.502 million of wheat.

Producers who enroll in several Farm Services Agency programs must submit to USDA an annual report regarding all cropland use on their farms.

USDA uses the information as an element in its crop estimates, which cover all farms, not just those who participate in the farm program.

[Floods: Argentina's Cordoba Province Could Be Unseeded in the Next Campaign a Million Hectares](#)

This follows from the analysis of satellite images; there are 500,000 hectares of corn and soybeans that have not yet been able to reap

A report warns that in the province of Córdoba there is a risk that this year be left unplanted one million hectares by the continuity of water flooding in the fields. This is 11% of productive land in the province, amounting to 9,079,306 hectares.

The work was done by Pablo Ginestet, producer, expert in satellite images and drones and delegate to the National Emergency Commission and Agricultural Disaster by Argentine Rural

Confederations (CRA). Ginestet made based on satellite images Landsat 8 an analysis of the water situation in the departments of Presidente Roque Sáenz Peña, Marcos Juárez, Unión, Celman, General San Martín, San Justo and General Roca, representing more than 56% the cultivated area of the province.

In hectares, 5,045,080 hectares meet these departments and make them 69% of the provincial wheat, 86% barley, 57% of the soybeans, 44% of corn, 72% sunflower, 56% of peanuts and 52 % sorghum.

Of the Cordovan departments, Roque Saenz Pena, Marcos Juárez Unión and are the highest degree of involvement.

"There are areas that are very committed, with situations that are more than 50% involvement. In all cases it is discounted the surface that historically occupied the permanent bodies of water, whether, ponds or marshes," said the specialist.

Ginestet calculated based on satellite images that currently there are 500,000 hectares of corn and soybeans that have not been able to collect to be flooded or floor problems.

The threat is strong for next season. In this line, if you take into account the rising floodwaters and the effect of groundwater -in many areas within a meter of profundity, there are about one million hectares are affected.

According Ginestet, those hectares "possibly this year run serious risk that can not plant, bringing with it major economic loss future, both the producer and the provincial and national coffers."
Source: La Nación

[U.S. July Soybean Crush Falls Below Expectations - NOPA](#)

By Mark Weinraub

CHICAGO, Aug 15 (Reuters) - The pace of U.S. soybean processing fell below market forecasts during July and came in lower than a year earlier, the National Oilseed Processors Association said on Monday.

NOPA said that its members crushed 143.715 million bushels of soybeans in July, down from 145.050 million during June. In July 2015, the NOPA crush was 145.227 million bushels.

Analysts had been expecting a July crush of 146.729 million bushels. Crush forecasts ranged from 142.643 million to 150.000 million bushels, with a median of 147.500 million bushels.

NOPA said that soymeal exports fell to 579,417 tons in July from 594,710 tons in June. In July 2015, soymeal exports were 590,582 tons.

Soyoil stocks as of July 31 stood at 1.743 billion lbs. Analysts had forecast soyoil stocks of 2.000 billion lbs. Stocks were 1.985 billion lbs a year ago and 1.624 billion at the end of June.

NOPA is the largest U.S. trade group for oilseed processors. It releases crush data on the 15th of each month or the next business day.

[Cargill, Louis Dreyfus Halt Brazil Soy Plants as Margins Vanish](#)

Cargill Inc. and Louis Dreyfus Co. are among the **companies that have stopped some processing of soybeans in** Brazil, the world's biggest exporter of the commodity, amid a domestic shortage and vanishing profit margins.

Cargill has idled its Primavera do Leste plant in Mato Grosso and Tres Lagoas factory in Mato Grosso do Sul, according to people familiar with the matter who asked to not be identified because information hasn't been made public. The Minneapolis-based company has six facilities in Brazil that crush soybeans to make vegetable oil and animal feed.

Louis Dreyfus said last week it will halt soybean crush at two of its five soybean crushing factories in the country because of "current supply and demand conditions." Brazilian crusher Granol Industria Comercio & Exportacao SA stopped processing at its plant in Porto Nacional, Tocantins, in June.

Brazil's soybean crop, the world's second-largest, is estimated by the government to be 0.8 percent smaller in the 2015-16 season following a drought. Output in the state of Tocantins, for example, is 30 percent lower. The "aggressiveness" of trading companies buying soybeans for export has further stoked the shortage, Granol Chief Financial Officer Regina Cadette said in an e-mail.

Availability of the oilseed isn't the only problem for processors. Domestic demand for soy-meal, which is mostly what crushers produce, has been undermined by the weakened state of Brazil's chicken industry, the soybean processors' main client. The chicken companies have reduced output in response to a domestic shortage of corn, which has pushed up feed costs, as well as falling consumption.

"There will be not enough beans supply and meal demand for all in the last quarter of the year," Suzi Pereira, a director at Algar Agro, which owns two crushing plants in Brazil, said in a telephone interview.

Brazilian crushing volumes will fall about 5 percent this year, said Algar's Pereira, though industry group Abiove is less gloomy, estimating a domestic crush of 40.7 million metric tons, little changed from 2015.

Brazil's soybean exports peaked in April, earlier in the year than is usually the case. The harvest, which finished in June, totaled 95.4 million tons, down 5 percent from an initial forecast, according to government data. As a result, Brazil doesn't have enough soybeans to meet its export commitments while maintaining crushing volumes.

Negative Margins

That also means Brazilian crushing margins have turned negative, Ken Zaslow, a BMO Capital Markets analyst, said in an Aug. 9 report. In order to avoid losses, some of the biggest companies involved in crushing have brought forward maintenance work that's usually done in the fourth quarter, Debora Pereira da Silva, an analyst at the University of Sao Paulo's Cepea research arm, said in a telephone interview.

"Oilseed processors are looking for better results in the coming months and choosing to freeze production now," Da Silva said. "Some of them may only come back in 2017."

The remaining Brazilian soybean inventories are being held by farmers on expectations of a price rebound, and a weakening of the real, which would boost export earnings, she said.

Cargill last week posted an adjusted operating loss in the three months ended May 31 of \$19 million, compared with an operating profit of \$230 million a year earlier, citing negative factors including wrong-way bets in soybean markets.

[Long-Term Study Links Neonicotinoids to Wild Bee Declines](#)

By Kate Kelland

LONDON, Aug 16 (Reuters) - Wild bees that forage from oilseed rape crops treated with insecticides known as neonicotinoids are more likely to undergo long-term population declines than bees that forage from other sources, according to the findings of an 18-year study.

The new research covered 62 species of bee found in the wild in Britain and found a link between their shrinking populations and the use of neonicotinoid pesticides.

Neonicotinoids are used worldwide in a range of crops and have been shown in lab-based studies to be harmful to certain species of bee - notably commercial honeybees and bumblebees.

The European Union limited use of the chemicals - made and sold by various companies including Bayer CropScience and Syngenta - two years ago, after research pointed to risks for bees, which are crucial for pollinating crops.

Neonicotinoids were initially licensed for use as a pesticide in Britain in 2002. By 2011, the proportion of UK oilseed rape seeds treated with them was 83 percent, according to the researchers leading this latest study.

Going back to data from 1994 up to 2011, the scientists analyzed how large-scale applications of neonicotinoids to oilseed rape crops influenced bee population changes.

The results, published in the journal Nature Communications, found that bees foraging on treated oilseed rape were three times more likely to experience population declines than bees foraging from other crops or wild plants.

Giving details at a briefing in London, Ben Woodcock, who co-led the study, said the average decline in population across all 62 species was 7.0 percent, but the average decline among 34 species that forage on oilseed rape was higher, at 10 percent.

Five of the 62 species studied declined by 20 percent or more, he said, and the worst affected declined by 30 percent.

Woodcock, an ecological entomologist at the Natural Environmental Research Council Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, said the findings showed the extent of the impact.

"Prior to this, people had an idea that something might be happening, but no-one had an idea of the scale," he told reporters. "(Our results show that) it's long-term, it's large scale, and it's many more species than we knew about before."

Woodcock's team said this should add to the body of evidence being considered in a review of neonicotinoid risks to bees being carried out by the European Food Standards Authority, expected to be completed by January 2017.

Christopher Connolly, a neurobiologist and bee expert at the University of Dundee, who was not directly involved in this research, said: "The evidence against neonicotinoids now exists in key bee brain cells involved in learning and memory, in whole bees, entire colonies and now at the level of whole populations of wild bees."

[Indian Refiners Switch to Soybean as Palm Prices Rally](#)

By Rajendra Jadhav

MUMBAI, Aug 17 (Reuters) - The share of palm oil in India's growing edible oil imports is likely to plunge to a record low this marketing year as a rally in prices slashes its discount over rival soybean.

That shift in the world's top palm oil importer could drag on benchmark prices for palm oil that have surged around a third in the last 12 months, while bolstering markets for soybean.

Edible oils are a common ingredient in Indian cuisine, used in everything from curries to samosas, with soybean seen as more healthy than palm.

"Palm oil discounts are consistently reducing over soybean. At the current price level, Indian refiners are inclined to switch to soybean," said Govindbhai Patel, managing director at edible oil trading firm GG Patel & Nihil Research Co.

Palm's discount to soybean has more than halved to \$70 per tonne, from \$171 in August 2015, according to data from Mumbai-based trade body the Solvent Extractors Association of India (SEA).

India's overall edible oil imports are expected to rise 1.4 percent in the 2015/16 marketing year that ends in October to 14.6 million tonnes due to rising consumption, Patel said, but palm imports will drop 12 percent to 8.4 million tonnes.

That will crimp palm's share of total edible oil imports to 57 percent - the lowest since India eased restrictions on such imports in the early 1990s. Palm oil's share of India's edible oil imports stood at 66 percent last year, down from 86 percent in 2007/08.

India's monthly palm oil imports fell to 570,051 tonnes in July, the lowest since February 2015. And soybean imports have jumped as palm purchases have faded.

The country has so far in 2015/16 imported a record 3.1 million tonnes soybean and total purchases in the year to October are set to rise to 4.25 million tonnes, up 42 percent from last year's 3 million tonnes, Patel said.

India mainly imports palm oil from Malaysia and Indonesia, while its soybean comes from Argentina and Brazil.

"In coming months, palm oil prices have to fall to remain competitive against soybean," said an official with a leading edible oil refinery based at central Indian city Indore. He asked not to be identified as he is not authorised to speak with media.

[New Zealand EPA Declares Glyphosate as Noncarcinogenic](#)

The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) of New Zealand released the results of their *Review of Evidence Relating to Glyphosate and Carcinogenicity*. According to the report, "glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic or carcinogenic to humans and does not require classification under HSNO as a carcinogen or mutagen." The results are based on the weight of available evidences, taking into consideration the quality and reliability of available data.

In 1993, the U.S. EPA classified glyphosate as Group E carcinogen, which is defined as having "evidence of non-carcinogenicity for humans". Then in 2015, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified the herbicide as Group 2A (probably carcinogenic to humans), which was based on lack of evidence from human data but sufficient evidence in animal-experiments. The latest report of New Zealand EPA used more recent studies and reviews on glyphosate.

[Americans Should Eat Less Meat, but They're Eating More and More](#)

Updated by Eliza Barclay on August 18, 2016

[Vox](#) |

The campaign to persuade us to cut back on burgers and bacon has been a bust so far.

For most of the past decade, meat consumption in the United States was falling. In 2014, Americans ate 18 percent less beef, 10 percent less pork, and 1.4 percent less chicken than they did in 2005, [according to](#) the US Department of Agriculture.

For environmental, health, and animal welfare advocates, this was great news. Surely it meant that efforts to raise awareness about the disturbing impacts of meat production were inspiring people to cut back on hamburgers and bacon. As Paul Shapiro, vice president of Farm Animal Protection for the Humane Society of the United States, [wrote](#) in 2012, "The pressure is being felt all over, and for the first time in decades, our overconsumption of meat is beginning to get reined in."

Now it appears that might have been a bit too optimistic. The American way of gorging on meat, it seems, isn't budging anytime soon.

According to a recent [analysis](#) from Rabobank, a Dutch bank, consumption of meat in the United States rose by 5 percent in 2015 — the biggest increase in 40 years. And, the author notes, in the coming years per-person meat eating is expected to reach highs not seen in more than a decade.

"There's a roller-coaster effect here, and we are about to start an upswing," says [Will Sawyer](#), an animal protein analyst with Rabobank and the author of the report.

That means Americans will remain among the biggest meat eaters [on Earth](#). And it's clearer than ever that meat consumption is a really tough behavior to change.

Activists who desperately want us to cut back may need to think harder about what messages American consumers really respond to. They may need to reach new people who can't fathom how

a plant-based diet could possibly be delicious. And perhaps it's time to think about other ways to blunt the harms of meat production and consumption.

How US meat consumption bounced back after years of decline

As it turns out, there was a simple reason meat consumption dropped between 2005 and 2014. It wasn't growing awareness about animal rights or the environment; instead, it was that supplies were tight and prices were higher.

Ranchers and farmers trimmed their herds because of the recession, historically high feed costs, and drought in the Great Plains. Meanwhile, domestic disease outbreaks like porcine epidemic diarrhea virus, or PEDv, meant that tens of thousands of hogs never made it to market. So Americans cut back on meat.

But by 2015, many of these issues driving higher prices were resolved. The retail price of beef has dropped by 22 percent, pork by 7 percent, and chicken by 5 percent. So Americans are eating more meat again.

"Consumers are responding to falling prices. That's a big part of the story," says Sawyer. The chicken industry, in particular, has also gotten more efficient and more capable of raising chickens fast. (In some cases, there's been oversupply and a rise in cold storage of meat.)

As a result, Sawyer expects that by 2018 we'll find ourselves back at the per capita meat-eating levels of the mid-2000s. "All those US consumers that got priced out of beef market are going to be able to come back to price level that they haven't seen for five to six years," he says.

Still, a lot of influential people are worried about meat's impact on the planet

While meat producers and meat lovers may cheer the "record US protein expansion" described in the Rabobank report, it also may represent the failure, so far, of the effort to convince Americans to eat less meat.

We now know that the de facto industrial model of raising livestock has had all kinds of negative impacts: It's a major contributor to climate change, antibiotic resistance, water pollution, and air pollution. The people who raise and kill the animals often work in unjust, unhealthy conditions. Feeding the billions of animals we raise for meat with corn and soy takes up precious land and puts pressure on wildlife. And we have good evidence that high meat consumption is linked to risks of cardiovascular disease, diabetes, some forms of cancer, and premature death.

There's a whole cottage industry of people raising concerns about the meat industry, from activists to nonprofits to scientists to international policy wonks at places like the Chatham House and the United Nations. We have piles of popular books (*In Defense of Food*, *Eating Animals*, *The Meat Racket*) and documentaries (*Forks Over Knives*, *Food Inc.*) on these topics, and we've seen everyone

from Venus Williams to [Bill Gates](#) to Jim Cameron to Pastor Rick Warren decry the American way of producing and eating meat.

As author and neuroscientist Sam Harris noted on a recent [podcast](#), he and Yale psychologist [Paul Bloom](#) think eating meat raised the conventional way will be something our descendants will be as scandalized by as we are about slavery: "We've both said our descendants would be horrified to know what we did with factory farming — the way we mistreated and killed billions of animals in a way we managed to do more or less with a clear conscience simply because we were keeping the details out of sight and out of mind."

Yet for all the pronouncements, reports, and "Meatless Monday" events urging us to eat less meat, it's clear the needle hasn't moved very much. (In fairness, it's impossible to know what consumption would be without those awareness campaigns, as Paul Shapiro of the Humane Society of the US points out.)

Indeed, Blake Hurst, a Missouri farmer and longtime critic of the food movement, had a point when he [wrote](#) this month in National Review, "We now all talk like [Michael] Pollan, but, a decade on, we still like a good hamburger or a perfectly prepared steak."

Vegetarianism is growing, but it remains relatively small

What makes this result so surprising is that it often *seems* like vegetarianism is on the rise.

It's increasingly touted in popular media as a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve health. We're seeing more and more veggie burgers and other meat alternatives on grocery store shelves and menus. A renowned Stanford geneticist invented a version of one with genuinely "meaty umami" flavor (listen to Vox's [Ezra Klein's interview](#) with him for more on that). Chef David Chang is now serving that very [veggie burger](#) in New York City.

So how do we square these two trends?

[Jayson Lusk](#) is an agricultural economist who runs a monthly survey of Americans' food preferences. He says that overall, he hasn't seen significant changes over time in terms of consumer preference for meat.

But in the past three years, Lusk has asked people if they were vegetarian or vegan. And here he has found a subtle but clear increase:

"There are two things going on at same time," Lusk says. "The average meat demand has stayed relatively steady. But also on one end of the distribution, there does seem to be uptick in consumers choosing to be vegetarian and vegan."

To him, it's a sign that a few people are hearing the messages about climate change, health, and animal welfare and are changing their behavior. And there's other evidence out there that Americans do aspire to eat less meat, like [this](#) survey NPR did with Truven Health Analytics.

But it's hard to tell whether we can expect a bigger shift away from meat anytime soon.

"We know from other research that stories about climate change and animal welfare could have an impact on meat demand. We have a lot of good evidence that news stories on saturated fat had a big impact on demand for beef, eggs, and pork," says Lusk. "But it takes a long time for this kind of change to occur in a big way. It's hard to predict when a trend will take off and have big impact on meat demand. "

Why is it so hard to convince Americans to eat less meat?

It's worth looking at why shifting a nation like America away from a food like meat is such a tall order.

Let's start with the obvious: Human beings enjoy eating meat for powerful biological reasons. It's flavorful, nourishing, and satiating. It was essential to our evolution.

Biological anthropologist Richard Wrangham argues in his book *Catching Fire* that the invention of cooked meat made it possible for us to develop bigger, smarter brains. "The extra energy [in the cooked meat] gave the first cooks biological advantages," he writes. "They survived and reproduced better than before. Their genes spread. ... There were changes in anatomy, physiology, ecology, life history, psychology, and society."

Meat is also deeply embedded into American food culture: Think of all the holidays, all the iconic meat brands like McDonald's, all the traditions that revolve around eating meat. We are inundated with marketing and advertisements encouraging us to go for that carnitas burrito and the double bacon cheeseburger.

As food historian Rachel Laudan [has argued](#), eating meat is the expression of being modern, progressive, and civilized: "Here's the challenge of meat for those who want to persuade people to eat less. ... For many in the United States and for many, many more around the world, meat eating is not just matter of taste or the environment, it's a foothold, it's a stake in the rich, modern world. It's a sign that they too can leave behind the hierarchical societies of the past and be full citizens and enjoy what we already enjoy in the United States."

It's tough to convince people to cut back on something they crave, something so symbolic that's largely very affordable and accessible (at least in the United States). Think about how long it took to persuade tens of millions of Americans to quit smoking.

And many have argued that you're going to need a really compelling alternative to meat to win the battle. According to Sawyer of Rabobank, we're not there yet. "Plant-based substitutes for meat have not gotten to the point where they can compete with meat on flavor, price, texture," Sawyer tells me. (We are seeing a more significant shift in the dairy sector, where almond and other plant-based milks and cheese have a rapidly growing market share.)

The Impossible Foods veggie burger that bleeds may turn out to be a revolutionary invention. So could some of the other synthetic and lab-grown meat products in the pipeline from the likes of Memphis Meats, Modern Meadows, or Mosa Meat. The group [New Harvest](#) is very optimistic about the future of "cellular agriculture." (Read New Harvest CEO Isha Datar's vision for the "post-animal bioeconomy" [here](#).) But these new technologies and products won't be game changers unless a critical mass of people buy them and endorse them as palatable alternatives to meat.

Sawyer of Rabobank agrees that the plant-based trend has staying power and could take off; he notes that once people get turned on to and can access lots of vegetables (which many Americans [still cannot](#)), it's easier to eat less meat. Yet "there are hundreds of millions of Americans who don't really know about plant-based diets or haven't been persuaded to follow one," he says. It also may seem more expensive (though that's debatable, since beans are one of the cheapest high-protein substitutes for meat you can buy).

As Sawyer points out, we increasingly live in a tiered food system, where the wealthy can buy alternative products — meatless ones, but also organic and antibiotic-free meats. But those aren't universal. And most people still choose what meat to eat based on what's the cheapest cut available at Walmart or the latest promotion at Burger King.

If we're so sensitive to price, should we tax meat?

Americans ate less meat in the past decade because prices went up. So what if we added the costs of greenhouse gas emissions from livestock to the price of meat on a per-pound basis? After all, there's good evidence that the single greatest contributor to the decline in smoking here was taxing tobacco.

A tax on meat is something Jayson Lusk has thought about quite a bit. Here's what he [writes](#) in a recent blog post:

Suppose you wanted to "internalize" the impacts you're having on climate change by altering how much beef, pork, and poultry you buy. To do this, take the price you see at the grocery store and add about \$0.18/lb to the price of beef, \$0.04/lb to the price of pork, and less than a penny to the price of poultry, and act *as if* these were the prices actually being charged. Would you change your behavior much based on such price increase? ... The key isn't to have zero greenhouse gas impacts, but rather to make sure you're taking into account the cost of those impacts.

This is politically unfeasible in the short term — Americans are averse to more taxes, and the meat industry would likely fight any meat tax tooth and nail. Don't forget that it successfully lobbied to dilute the most recent version of the dietary guidelines after a scientific panel recommended that the guidelines discourage red meat consumption for health and environmental reasons (they no longer do).

If a tax on meat sounds like it would be unfair to the poor, scholars are working on that very question: Check out this paper by researchers writing in the *European Review of Agricultural Economics* about how a meat tax could "address differing nutrient needs and purchasing behaviors among households."