

A Comparative Analysis of Farmed Animal Protection Laws in the European Union and the United States

Joyce Tischler* and Suzannah Smith**

Abstract

Industrial animal agriculture is the predominant form of meat, dairy and egg production in the US, Europe and many other parts of the world. This food production system, which the US Environmental Protection Agency calls concentrated animal feeding operations or CAFOs, forces 80 billion farmed animals per year to live crowded together and in intensive confinement during the 99% of their lives in which they are being raised. If left unregulated, the agriculture industry treats these animals as if they are automatons whose basic needs and interests can be ignored. Starting in 1974, the European Union (EU) has passed five directives that set specific and measurable husbandry and housing requirements for farmed animals. The EU directives, while not perfect, offer the highest standards in the world for rearing farmed animals. The US, on the other hand, has no federal law that would establish minimum standards for how farmed animals are housed and treated, leaving such decisions to the industry that owns and raises those animals, and forcing American animal advocates to search for other legal avenues to increase protections for farmed animals. This paper offers a comparative analysis of the US and EU legal standards for raising farmed animals.

Keywords

Farmed animals; industrial; agriculture; EU; US; directives; battery cages; gestation crates

I. Introduction

Eighty billion farmed animals are raised and killed each year across the globe, and the dominant form of production of these animals is what the United States (US) Environmental Protection Agency calls 'concentrated animal feeding operations' or 'CAFOs'.¹ Inside CAFOs, thousands (or tens of thousands) of animals are generally crowded indoors and

* Joyce Tischler is a Professor of Practice at the Center for Animal Law Studies at Lewis & Clark Law School in Portland, Oregon, US, where she teaches Industrial Animal Agriculture Law. In 1979, Professor Tischler co-founded the Animal Legal Defense Fund (ALDF), where she served as the CEO for 25 years and thereafter, the general counsel until 2019, working to build that NGO and the animal law movement.

** Suzannah Smith is a JD candidate entering her third year at Lewis & Clark Law School. She is heavily involved in animal law, including a clerkship in 2023 with Professor Tischler and a litigation clerkship in summer 2024 for the Animal Legal Defense Fund. Suzannah serves on the Board of Directors of the Lewis & Clark ALDF chapter, and she will be the co-director of that student group for 2024–25. She will also serve as the Editor-in-Chief of the Animal Law Review for 2024–25.

¹ US Environmental Protection Agency, 'Regulatory Definitions of Large CAFOs, Medium CAFO, and Small CAFOs' <https://www3.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/sector_table.pdf> accessed 15 March 2024. See also Hannah McKay, 'Mega Farms Called CAFOs Dominate Animal Agriculture Industry' (*Sentient Media*, 29 September 2021) <<https://sentientmedia.org/cafo/>> accessed 15 March 2024.

denied the ability to engage in natural activities.² To respond to the frustration and coping responses that the animals exhibit in this highly unnatural production system, the US agricultural industry has devised a variety of mutilations, such as: tail docking; castration; and removal of horns, the tips of birds' beaks, and toes, all performed without anesthesia or analgesics.³ While this system was invented in the US, it now exists or is being introduced into most other countries.⁴

This paper will review the laws that have been developed by the European Union (EU) to provide minimum protections for land animals while they are being raised for food, which is 99% of the time they are alive, and it will compare those laws to the laws of the US.⁵ While still flawed, EU laws offer the highest welfare standards for farmed animals currently seen in the world.⁶ In juxtaposition, there is no federal US law protecting farmed animals while they are being raised for food production.⁷

II. Farmed Animal Welfare Legislation in the European Union

The EU first began legislating to protect farmed animals in 1974.⁸ It has passed five directives⁹ that set standards for farmed animals' housing and treatment: Council Directive 1999/74/EC of 19 July 1999, laying down minimum standards for the protection of egg-laying hens ('Hens Directive');¹⁰ Council Directive 2007/43/EC of 28 June 2007, laying down minimum standards for the protection of chickens kept for meat production ('Chickens Directive');¹¹ Council Directive 2008/120/EC of 18 December 2008, laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs ('Pigs Directive');¹² Council Directive 2008/119/EC of 18 December 2008, laying down minimum standards for the protection of calves ('Calves

² See McKay (n 1).

³ See *ibid.*

⁴ See Hemi Kim, 'Factory Farming: What the Industry Doesn't Want You to Know' (*Sentient Media*, 4 August 2021) <<https://sentientmedia.org/factory-farming/>> accessed 15 March 2024.

⁵ This paper covers land animals (livestock and poultry) during the time they are being raised for food. It does not cover laws on transport or slaughter, nor does it cover fish and aquatic animals because the laws and methods of raising or catching the latter are quite different.

⁶ See Nicholas K Pedersen, 'Detailed Discussion of European Animal Welfare Laws 2003 to Present: Explaining the Downturn' (*The Animal Legal and Historical Center*, 2009) <<https://www.animallaw.info/article/detailed-discussion-european-animal-welfare-laws-2003-present-explaining-downturn>> accessed 15 March 2024.

⁷ See Animal Welfare Institute, *Legal Protection for Animals on Farms* (May 2022) 1 <<https://awionline.org/sites/default/files/uploads/documents/22-Legal-Protections-Farm.pdf>> accessed 15 March 2024.

⁸ See Denis Simonin and Andrea Gavinelli, 'The European Union Legislation on Animal Welfare: State of Play, Enforcement and Future Activities' in Sophie Hild and Louis Schweitzer (eds) *Animal Welfare: From Science to Law* (La Fondation Droit Animal, Ethique et Sciences 2019) 59 <<https://www.fondation-droit-animal.org/documents/AnimalWelfare2019.v1.pdf>> accessed 15 March 2024).

⁹ EU directives are binding for all Member States of the EU and they dictate the end result that is to be achieved. However, it is left to the Member States to determine the methods for how to achieve the result. By contrast, an EU regulation is binding and automatically becomes part of the national law of each Member State.

¹⁰ Council Directive 1999/74/EC, Laying Down Minimum Standards for the Protection of Laying Hens [1999] OJ L 203, 53.

¹¹ Council Directive 2007/43/EC, Laying Down Minimum Rules for the Protection of Chickens Kept for Meat Production [2007] OJ L 128, 19.

¹² Council Directive 2008/120/EC, Laying Down Minimum Standards for the Protection of Pigs [2008] OJ L 47, 5.

Directive’);¹³ and Council Directive 98/58/EC of 20 July 1998, concerning the protection of all other farmed animals (‘General Directive’).¹⁴

For purposes of illustration, a more detailed review of the Hens Directive demonstrates the level of detail common in EU farmed animal legislation. For example, the Hens Directive specifies measurements and requirements for egg-laying hen housing systems.¹⁵ In 1993, six years before the Hens Directive was approved, the European Commission received a report from the Scientific Veterinary Committee (‘Committee’) about the welfare of egg-laying hens in differing housing systems. The Committee advised the Commission that hens kept in battery cages experience very poor welfare.¹⁶ The Hens Directive banned battery cages as of 1 January 2012.¹⁷ From 1 January 2003–1 January 2012, no new battery cages could be built.¹⁸ From 2003–12, battery cages were required to provide at least 550 square centimeters (‘cm’) of space per hen, and to be at least 40 cm high in over 65% of the cage area, among other requirements.¹⁹

While banning battery cages was a positive step, the European Union still allows producers to house egg-laying hens in ‘enriched cages’.²⁰ The Hens Directive requires that an enriched cage provides 750 cm² area per hen, 600 cm² of which must be usable space;²¹ a nest in which to lay their eggs;²² litter that enables behaviors such as pecking and scratching;²³ and perches for resting on, which allow at least 15 cm of space per hen.²⁴ Enriched cages have become the dominant housing system in the EU for egg-laying hens.²⁵

European animal advocacy groups argue that while enriched cages are an improvement over barren battery cages, they are not a major improvement because the additional space requirements are too small, and the equipment for perching and scratching are too meager to enable hens to engage in natural hen behaviors.²⁶

The Hens Directive also sets standards for alternatives to caged housing, to wit, cage free and free range systems.²⁷ It requires all alternative housing systems to provide at least one square meter of usable area for every nine hens and at least one nest for every seven hens, with at least one square meter of nest space for a maximum of 120 hens if group nests are

¹³ Council Directive 2008/119/EC, Laying Down Minimum Standards for the Protection of Calves [2008] OJ L 10, 7.

¹⁴ Council Directive 98/58/EC, Concerning the Protection of Animals Kept for Farming Purposes Which Covers all Other Farmed Animals [1998] OJ L 221, 23.

¹⁵ See Council Directive 1999/74/EC [1999] OJ L 203, 53.

¹⁶ See European Commission Press Release IP/98/235, The European Commission Adopts Measures to Improve the Welfare of Laying Hens (11 March 1998).

¹⁷ See Council Directive 1999/74/EC [1999] OJ L 203, art 5, 53, 55.

¹⁸ See *ibid.*

¹⁹ See *ibid.* 54–55.

²⁰ Council Directive 1999/74/EC [1999] OJ L 203, 53, 55.

²¹ See Council Directive 1999/74/EC [1999] OJ L 203, art 6, 53, 55.

²² See *ibid.*

²³ See *ibid.*

²⁴ See *ibid.*

²⁵ See Hans-Wilhelm Windhorst, ‘EU Egg Production Since the Exit from Conventional Cages’ (2019) 53(1) *Lohmann Information* 4 <<https://lohmman-breeders.com/media/2020/08/VOL53-WINDHORST.pdf>> accessed 15 March 2014.

²⁶ See ‘Better Lives for Laying Hens’ (*Eurogroup for Animals*) <<https://www.eurogroupforanimals.org/what-we-do/areas-of-concern/better-lives-laying-hens>> accessed 15 March 2024.

²⁷ Council Directive 1999/74/EC [1999] OJ L 203, art 4, 53, 54.

used.²⁸ The hens must be provided with adequate perches with at least 15 cm per hen.²⁹ The hens must be given at least 250 square cm of littered area per hen, with the litter occupying at least one third of the ground surface.³⁰ If the housing is an aviary, or multi-level system, there must be no more than four levels; the headroom between the levels must be at least 45 cm; the drinking and feeding facilities must be distributed in such a way as to provide equal access for all hens; and the levels must be arranged to prevent feces droppings from falling on the levels below.³¹ If hens have access to outdoor open runs (fenced areas where the hens can roam), there must be several popholes (doorways large enough for a chicken to move through) giving direct access to the outdoor area.³² The popholes must be at least 35 cm high and 40 cm wide and extend along the entire length of the building with total openings of two meters per 1000 hens.³³

In all housing systems, the Hens Directive mandates that hens must be inspected at least once per day, the sound level within the housing must be minimized, all buildings must have light levels sufficient to allow all hens to show normal levels of activity, feces must be removed as often as necessary, and dead hens must be removed every day.³⁴ All mutilations are prohibited. However, beak trimming (cutting off the end of the hen's beak) may be performed if done to prevent feather pecking and cannibalism, and carried out by qualified staff on chicks who are less than ten days old.³⁵

Enforcement of the EU farmed animal welfare laws poses a significant problem as the actual farming practices vary widely amongst the Member States.³⁶ For example, Austria, Luxembourg, and Sweden have almost completely eradicated the use of cages, whereas Spain, Portugal, and Malta still largely rely on them.³⁷

The other EU directives have a similar level of specificity. Sows cannot be kept in gestation crates except during the first four weeks of pregnancy.³⁸ Tethering calves with chains or ropes to limit their movement is prohibited.³⁹ Chickens raised for meat must be inspected twice daily and have permanent access to dry litter, and the workers who oversee their care must be trained.⁴⁰ Dairy cows must not be given bovine somatotropin as it increases the risk of mastitis and foot and leg problems, both of which cause pain and suffering for the cows.⁴¹

²⁸ See *ibid.*

²⁹ See *ibid.*

³⁰ See *ibid.*

³¹ See *ibid.*

³² See *ibid.*

³³ See *ibid.*

³⁴ See Council Directive 1999/74/EC, annex [1999] OJ L 203, 53, 57.

³⁵ See *ibid.*

³⁶ See European Court of Auditors, *Animal Welfare in the EU: Closing the Gap Between Ambitious Goals and Practical Implementation* (Special Report, no 31, annex II, 2018) <https://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/ECADocuments/SR18_31/SR_ANIMAL_WELFARE_EN.pdf> accessed 15 March 2024.

³⁷ See Elisa Kollenda and others, *Transitioning to Cage-Free Farming in the EU* (Policy Report, Institute for European Environmental Policy, October 2020) 10 <https://ieep.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Transitioning-towards-cage-free-farming-in-the-EU_Final-report_October_web.pdf> accessed 15 March 2024.

³⁸ See Council Directive 2008/120/EC [2008] OJ L 47, art 3, 5, 7.

³⁹ See Council Directive 2008/119/EC, annex [2008] OJ L 10, 7, 10.

⁴⁰ See Council Directive 2007/43/EC, annex I [2007] OJ L182, 19, 24.

⁴¹ See Council Decision 1999/879/EC, Concerning the Placing on the Market and Administration of Bovine Somatotrophin (BST) and Repealing Decision 90/218/E [1999] OJ L 331, 71.

In 2020, the European Commission announced that, pursuant to its ‘Farm to Fork Strategy’, it planned to propose revised animal welfare legislation by 2023 to align the laws with the latest scientific evidence, broaden the scope of the laws, make it easier to enforce the laws, and ensure a higher level of animal welfare.⁴² However, the proposals to revise those laws did not meet the 2023 deadline and according to the European Commission, ‘the work is still ongoing’.⁴³

Meanwhile, animal advocates in Europe are conducting a campaign called End the Cage Age to halt the use of all cages for all farmed animals.⁴⁴ They argue that no matter how well a cage system is built and monitored, it still constitutes inferior welfare for the animals who must live in those cages because their movements are extremely restricted, and they are denied the ability to make choices about their surrounding environment, an ability that is central to an animal’s well-being.⁴⁵ The scope and content of future improvements to the EU laws relating to farmed animals, and whether advocates will get farmed animals out of cages, remains to be seen.⁴⁶

III. Farmed Animal Welfare Legislation in the US

Ten billion farmed animals are raised and killed annually in the US.⁴⁷ Yet there is absolutely no federal law covering the welfare of farmed animals while they are being raised in a production facility.⁴⁸ Thus, the animal agriculture industry sets animal welfare standards in the US.⁴⁹ These standards, or lack thereof, maximize industry profit at the expense of the animals’ welfare. Regarding egg-laying hens, the egg industry developed and uses battery cages for hens, extreme crowding is allowed, mutilations, such as beak trimming are standard, and because male chicks cannot produce eggs, they are killed soon after birth.⁵⁰ The World Organization for Animals (OIE) has established standards for raising farmed animals.⁵¹ However, the US is not in compliance with many of those standards.⁵²

The shocking disparity between the EU and US is driven in part by American agricultural exceptionalism and aversion to regulation. The CAFO system started in the US and resulted

⁴² European Commission, *Revision of the Animal Welfare Legislation* <https://food.ec.europa.eu/animals/animal-welfare/evaluations-and-impact-assessment/revision-animal-welfare-legislation_en#:~:text=Since%20it%20was%20the%20most,and%20cats%20and%20their%20traceability> accessed 15 March 2024.

⁴³ *ibid.*

⁴⁴ See Compassion in World Farming, *End the Cage Age – Why the EU Must Stop Caging Farm Animals* (Report, October 2020) 5 <<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/231961/End%20the%20Cage%20Age%20report,%20October%202020.pdf>> accessed 15 March 2024.

⁴⁵ See *ibid.* 6.

⁴⁶ See European Commission (n 42).

⁴⁷ See Hannah Ritchie, *How Many Animals are Factory-Farmed?* (*Our World in Data*, 25 September 2023) <<https://ourworldindata.org/how-many-animals-are-factory-farmed>> accessed 15 March 2024.

⁴⁸ See Animal Welfare Institute (n 7). For the sake of clarity, the US Congress has passed federal laws covering transport of animals, 49 USC § 80502 (Twenty-Eight Hour Law), and slaughter, Humane Methods of Livestock Slaughter Act, 7 USC §§ 1901–7.

⁴⁹ See David Green, ‘The Reality of the U.S. Approach to Animal Welfare’ (*Open Access Government*, 6 January 2023) <<https://www.openaccessgovernment.org/the-reality-of-the-u-s-approach-to-animal-welfare/150671/>> accessed 15 March 2024.

⁵⁰ See McKay (n 1).

⁵¹ See World Animal Protection, *Animal Protection Index (API) 2020 – United States of America: Ranking D* (March 2020) <https://api.worldanimalprotection.org/sites/default/files/api_2020_-_usa.pdf> accessed 15 March 2024.

⁵² See *ibid.*

in extreme corporate consolidation of the animal agriculture industry,⁵³ yet, massive corporations maintain the façade that they are and represent family farms.⁵⁴ Americans tend to view agriculture as inherently different from other industries,⁵⁵ and the myth of the small family farm, in which animals are raised out on pastures or the range, persists.⁵⁶ American culture is defined by hyper individualism; many Americans do not trust big government and dislike being regulated. This combination of societal and cultural factors facilitates the lack of any federal oversight in the US regarding how farmed animals are raised.

In response to the lack of federal law to set standards for how farmed animals are raised, some progress has been made in the US by animal advocacy organizations and voters acting at the state level.⁵⁷ Twenty-six of the fifty US states allow their citizens to pass laws through ballot initiatives, whereby the citizens bypass the state legislative process and vote directly on a proposal to make it into law.⁵⁸ Animal advocacy groups have successfully conducted ballot initiative campaigns in numerous states.⁵⁹ The first state farmed animal protection ballot initiative was passed by the voters of Florida in 2002, and outlawed gestation crates for housing sows (female pigs).⁶⁰ This was followed by an initiative in 2004, in which California voters outlawed the production and sale of foie gras made from force feeding ducks and geese in order to enlarge their livers; that law went into effect in 2012.⁶¹ Since then, the voters of over one dozen American states have banned some forms of intensive confinement or husbandry that causes farmed animal suffering.⁶² The other US states have

⁵³ See Kim (n 4).

⁵⁴ See Jessica Scott-Reid, 'The 'Humanewashing' of America's Meat and Dairy, Explained' (Vox, 21 December 2021, 8:00 AM) <<https://www.vox.com/22838160/animal-welfare-labels-meat-dairy-eggs-humane-humanewashing>> accessed 15 March 2024.

⁵⁵ See Jessica Guarino, 'The Injustices of Agricultural Exceptionalism: A History and Policy of Erasure' (2023) 27 Drake Journal of Agricultural Law 321, 322.

⁵⁶ See Charlotte E Blattner and Odile Ammann, 'Agricultural Exceptionalism and Industrial Animal Food Production: Exploring the Human Rights Nexus' (2020) 15(2) Journal of Food Law and Policy 92, 150.

⁵⁷ See Animal Welfare Institute (n 7) 1–9.

⁵⁸ See 'States with Initiative or Referendum' (Ballotpedia) <https://ballotpedia.org/States_with_initiative_or_referendum> accessed 15 March 2024.

⁵⁹ See American Welfare Institute (n 7) 9–12.

⁶⁰ See *ibid* 11.

⁶¹ See California Health & Safety Code, §§ 25980–25984 (2011).

⁶² Other state voter initiatives include the following measures: Arizona, 2006: banned gestation crates and 'veal' calf crates (Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated, § 13-2910.07); Oregon, 2007: outlawed gestation crates (Oregon Revised Statutes, § 600.150); California, 2008: banned battery cages, gestation crates and calf crates (California Health & Safety Code, § 25990); Colorado, 2008: banned gestation crates and calf crates (Colorado Revised Statutes Annotated, § 35-50.5-102); Maine, 2009: outlawed gestation crates and calf crates (Maine Revised Statutes Annotated, tit 7, § 4020); Michigan, 2009: banned battery cages, gestation crates and calf crates (Michigan Compiled Laws Annotated, § 287.746); California, 2009: banned tail docking of cattle (California Penal Code, § 597n); Ohio, 2011: banned tail docking of dairy cattle (Ohio Administrative Code 901:12-6-02); Washington State, 2011: producers with 3,000+ egg laying hens must give each hen 116.3 sq. inches of space and areas for nesting, scratching and perching (Washington Revised Code, §§ 69.25.065, 69.25.107); Rhode Island, 2012: banned gestation crates and calf crates (4 Rhode Island General Laws Annotated, § 4-1.1-3) and banned tail docking of cattle unless performed by a veterinarian while animal is anesthetized (*ibid* § 4-1-6.1); New Jersey, 2012: banned tail docking of cattle (New Jersey Administrative Code, § 2:8-2.6); Kentucky, 2014: veal calves must be raised in group housing (302 Kentucky Administrative Regulations, 21:030); Massachusetts, 2016: banned battery cages, gestation crates and calf crates (Massachusetts Acts, ch 333) (amended by legislation in 2021, now at 940 Code of Massachusetts Regulations, 36.00); Rhode Island, 2018: banned battery cages (Rhode Island General Laws Annotated, §§ 4-1.1-1 to 1.5); California, 2018: clarified 2008 bans, and prohibited in-state sale of products from egg-laying hens, sows and calves raised in intensive confinement (California Health & Safety Code, ch 13.8 § 25990); Oregon, 2019: banned in-state sale of eggs from battery caged hens (Oregon Revised Statutes, §§ 632.835–632.850); Colorado, 2020:

not prohibited intensive confinement, battery cages, gestation and farrowing crates, calf crates, or standardized husbandry that allows for mutilations such as tail docking, castration without anesthesia or analgesics, debeaking, dehorning, or toe trimming (of turkeys).

In 2018, California passed a ballot initiative referred to as ‘Proposition’ or ‘Prop 12’. Prop 12 bans the in-state sale of pork from CAFOs using gestation crates and sets the highest legal space requirements for pregnant pigs in the US. It also bans the in-state sale of veal (meat from calves) from facilities that use crates, and sets the highest legal space requirements for ‘veal calves’ in the US. An earlier initiative, (Prop 2, passed by the California voters in 2008) mandated that egg-laying hens must be able to turn around and spread their wings. Prop 12 explicitly establishes that eggs produced and sold in California must come from cage-free hens. The hens must be free to walk, dust bathe, perch, spread their wings, and lay their eggs in nest boxes, all vital behaviors they are prevented from doing when confined in cages. While cage-free does not guarantee ‘cruelty-free’, cage-free hens generally have better lives than those confined inside cages, because they have more ability to make choices about their own well-being. Liquid eggs (1/3 of all egg production) were not covered under previous California law. Prop 12 extends coverage to that source, thus protecting millions more birds. Prop 12 also adds enforcement mechanisms to current California law to allow increased ability to bring cases against violators.⁶³

Prop 12 was not passed without significant opposition from industry. Pork producers in states outside California sued the state, claiming that they should not be forced to meet California’s higher standards in order to sell pork in that state. The highly contentious lawsuit resulted in years of litigation and eventually made its way to the US Supreme Court, which upheld Prop 12.⁶⁴ While this victory came as a relief to American animal advocates, the US agricultural industry continues to propose legislation that would limit or reverse the gains made at the state level.⁶⁵

IV. Conclusion

Each year, the massive number of land animals raised for food on a worldwide basis is increasing.⁶⁶ The EU has assumed a position of leadership in passing legislation that mandates specific welfare requirements that are based on scientific review by a veterinary body. Unlike its European counterparts, the US Congress has exhibited an astonishing failure to lead the way for even minimal protection of farmed animals, and has ignored the demands of its own voters, citizens and consumers. The EU has developed directives that offer the

banned battery cages and prohibited in-state sale of eggs from hens raised in violation of this prohibition (Colorado Revised Statutes Annotated, § 35-21-203); Utah, 2021: banned battery cages (Utah Code Annotated, §§ 4-41-101 to 107); Nevada, 2021: banned battery cages and in-state sale of eggs from hens housed in violation of this prohibition (Nevada Statutes 2209) (temp); Arizona, 2022: banned battery cages and in-state sale of eggs from hens housed in violation of this prohibition (Arizona Administrative Code, § 3-2-90). This list is not inclusive of legislation and administrative actions.

⁶³ See California Health & Safety Code, §§ 25990–25994.

⁶⁴ See *National Pork Producers Council v Ross*, 598 US 1142 (2023).

⁶⁵ See, eg, Keith Loria, ‘How the EATS Act Could Impact the Food Industry’ (*Food Quality & Safety*, 16 October 2023) <<https://www.foodqualityandsafety.com/article/how-the-eats-act-could-impact-the-food-industry/>> accessed 15 March 2024.

⁶⁶ See David Stanway, ‘Countries Urged to Curb Factory Farming to Meet Climate Goals’ (*Reuters*, 28 November 2023, 11:07 PM) <<https://www.reuters.com/sustainability/countries-urged-curb-factory-farming-meet-climate-goals-2023-11-29/#:~:text=The%20charity%20said%20around%2070,tons%20of%20CO2%20emissions%20annually>> accessed 15 March 2024.

most robust protections anywhere in the world for farmed animals while they are being raised,⁶⁷ and we estimate that the EU laws protecting farmed animals are approximately two decades ahead of the laws in the US.

While, in both regions, improving farmed animal well-being faces obstacles, there are signs that conditions will continue to improve for farmed animals in Europe. American policy makers, on the other hand, remain under the control of the agriculture industry; thus, similar legislative gains do not appear to be forthcoming in the near future. Improvements in the US will be driven by voters and consumers who want more humane treatment to be accorded to farmed animals, and by animal advocates who are exploring a variety of ways to raise public awareness about the need for change.

⁶⁷ See Pedersen (n 6).