

HOW IS ANIMAL AGRICULTURE CONTRIBUTING TO GLOBAL WARMING?

Animal agriculture is contributing significantly to global warming and is predicted to contribute much more in the future. The method of sustaining and breeding animals for the cruel process is one of the factors that contributes to greenhouse gases annually produced by the industry, which make up 14.5% of global emissions, as well as the animal breeds themselves that through purely natural process but unnatural size in number contribute to this percent. Transportation, supermarket locality and excess waste, and the rising demands for animal products are all playing a role in the increasing contribution of animal agriculture to global warming. The ironic after-effect that global warming will in turn affect us as it affects the environment perhaps is one of the important reasons to understand how we can prevent this, by firstly understanding what needs to be changed in the system.

One of the primary reasons for animal agriculture's large contribution to global warming is, as I have mentioned in the introduction, the breed of animals that this industry cultivates. A generally well-known fact is that, of course, the natural waste products of a cow, for example, releases gases into the atmosphere and contributes to global warming as the greenhouse gases accumulate in the atmosphere. Due to the rising numbers of the population of livestock as demand for meat increases, these harmless 'natural waste products' end up multiplying until they become fatal to the deadly increase of CO₂ and methane emissions. The average person would in their lifetime eat 7,000 animals in total, which includes 11 cows, 2,400 sheep and 2,300 chickens. These popular livestock are bred at a price which deeply affects the environment and the use of land.

A report by the US declared that about 26 million tons of livestock feed comes from grain and 15 million tons of forage crop, which considering the amount an average human eats and the height of our population, could suggest the rising numbers of animals farmed annually. To grow that number of crops for the sole use of animal feed, when the study found it could sustain 800 million people in the US, is a ridiculous waste of food, especially when the UK has found that an average supermarket would throw away 190 million meals a year (which could have been given as charitable meals for the homeless, considering the increasing number in the UK) and most of it meat or dairy products. If the study from the US applied to other countries, it could mean that we could survive the number of crops already produced if not wasted on animal agriculture. As well as living on a healthier diet and wasting less, we could also be preventing overuse of land (which could lead to soil erosion and other nutritional problems which could prevent the growth of crops and therefore endanger not only animal agriculture but also the amount of food that the 7.9 billion people of this planet need to survive) and the loss of habitats. Already, North America and Europe are on track to be responsible for the loss of 25% of natural habitats home to 1,300 species while 96 are projected to lose 75% to farming expansion. Deforestation could further add to emissions as waste products such as CO₂ are released into the atmosphere. The possibility of creating a positive feedback loop through hazards such as wildfires in other parts of the world could lead to the worsening of this crisis and could endanger the farming industry itself. This contribution is now posing a threat now to animal agriculture itself clearly helps you understand how largely this contribution has gone out of hand. However, as the farming industry gains prominence as many developing countries rely on agriculture and more developed countries also as major exports, the idea of animal agriculture losing its underrated

threat to the worsening of climate change is far more out of reach than before. In fact, it is expected that the emissions produced by this industry are to rise 64-70% by 2050.

Another large way of animal agriculture's contribution to global warming is, like other industries, the carbon footprint of transportation. As intensive farming is increasing in popularity, as the number of animal products produced and the economic advantage in capitalist numbers, more animals are being bred and slaughtered for food, which links to my previous point on how the number of livestock is increasing and therefore increasing natural and human causes for rising greenhouse gas emissions, the more transportation is needed for final product. As I have mentioned in my first point, developing, and 'developed' countries both rely heavily on agriculture, and animal agriculture, which means that importing and exporting products long distances to other countries will mean much more energy required and more gases burned and emitted. Due to the COVID lockdown, ordering things online and having them delivered to our doors has become increasingly popular, and the use of vans to transport animal products once again means the release of greenhouse gases and contributing to global warming. However, this problem is one that is easily fixed, which entails the cutting down of meat production, therefore the order of long-conservation fruit and vegetables may decrease the number of vans needed as meat isn't sought for on a large scale. By cutting down on addiction and tradition, we can find that we do not just decrease the emissions produced by farming itself, but also by the things that help it become a successful business. Similarly, adjusting animal agriculture could also help prevent its contribution to global warming. One piece of research showed that if 50% less meat was to be consumed (or produced) it would be equivalent to 26 million cars off the road. So even starting on consuming and producing less would mean that the amount of vehicle use will also decrease.

My final point is about the future contribution of animal agriculture. I have already pointed out that by 2050, emissions produced by this industry will rise by 64-70%, and this could be added to the ever-growing population. As animal products are gaining popularity, and consumerism is also increasing, overpopulation would be a deciding point on the tipping scale of the danger of animal agriculture's contribution. The possibility of overpopulation could mean an increase in demand for food, therefore animal products. The more farms and factories built the more land destroyed in the making. The growth of crops to feed the bountifulness of livestock bred. Deforestation and the means of deforestation (such as the burning of habitats such as forests, a mode which has already been seen in various examples in the Amazon rainforest) could mean the excess rise in emissions. The more woodland burned, the less amount of vegetation able to absorb CO₂ and therefore decrease the amount of greenhouse gases. Again, positive feedback loops may be evident in certain hazards and further encouragement in their process could be the final call in the crisis. As more products need to be transported, the more gases released through modes of transportation. Farming may also be the cause of housing and inflation, both of which need to be addressed as a motive against industry. In summary, animal agriculture and agriculture in general is not seen to hold a positive future for the world at all.

In conclusion, animal agriculture contributes greatly to global warming and has a danger of becoming a larger threat to humankind in the foreseeable future, emphasizing the need for change, immediate or staggered.