

"THE IMPACT OF EXCESSIVE MEAT CONSUMPTION ON HUMAN HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT"

Xabibullayeva Parizodaxon

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20656603>

Abstract

This research examines the effects of excessive meat consumption on both human health and the environment. While meat provides essential nutrients such as protein, iron, and vitamin B12, consuming it in large quantities has been linked to several health problems, including cardiovascular diseases, type 2 diabetes, and certain types of cancer. The study also explores the environmental consequences of meat production, particularly greenhouse gas emissions, high water consumption, and extensive land use associated with livestock farming. Using a comparative approach, the research analyzes government policies in Denmark and Brazil to evaluate the role of state intervention in addressing these challenges. The findings suggest that policy measures such as dietary guidelines and environmental regulations can contribute to reducing the negative impacts of meat consumption. The study concludes that balancing nutritional needs, environmental sustainability, and economic interests requires effective government action and increased public awareness.

Keywords: excessive meat consumption, public health, greenhouse gas emissions, environmental sustainability, livestock production, government intervention, Denmark, Brazil, dietary guidelines.

Introduction

Meat consumption has been increasing rapidly since the 1960s. It has become a central part of diets in many countries; however, its growing demand has caused serious concerns. Meat is a nutritional source considered essential for optimal human growth and development (Higgs, 2000). It is a valuable source of high biological value protein, iron, vitamin B12 as well as other B complex vitamins, zinc, selenium and phosphorus (Pereira and Vicente 2013, 586). However, meat and saturated fat contribute to chronic diseases such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes mellitus and some types of cancer (Walker et al. 2005, 348). At the same time, the agriculture sector makes up 22% of total global greenhouse gas emissions, which is a similar contribution to industry and even greater than transport. Livestock production accounts for 80% of the sector's emissions (McMichael et al. 2007, 1253). Despite these concerns, people's preference for meat remains largely unchanged, causing more harm to both human health and the environment. This leaves policymakers with the task of finding a balanced solution that protects nature while also meeting people's needs.

Literature review

Human beings have evolved as omnivores, thus meat has been our main source of energy for millions of years. Sudden absence of meat from the diet may lead to nutritional deficiencies if not replaced properly. It is recommended to consume 70g of meat per day; anything more than that can lead to type 2 diabetes, cancer, and high blood pressure (NHS 2022). However, meat consumption has excessively increased to 300 million tons in 2010, compared to 50 million tons in 1960 around the globe, which is worrisome (Godfray et al. 2018). The current global average meat consumption is 100g per person per day (McMichael et al. 2007, 1253), which is above the standard line. All of these statistics show how much people are harming themselves just by eating extra portions of meat. Willett et al. stated that "This healthy

reference diet ... includes a low to moderate amount of seafood and poultry, and includes no or low quantity of red meat" (Willett et al. 2019), which explicitly recommends cutting down meat intake. In response to rising concerns about the negative impacts of excessive meat consumption, vegetarian and plant-based diets have become popular. In the US, Canada and the UK, vegetarians were asked why they have chosen to consume only non-animal-based diets. The majority of respondents said that they are worried about their health. Health and environmental reasons as well as being concerned for animals emerged as the top motivations in the survey results (Fox and Ward 2008, 422). This is still far from perfect, but at least now people are aware of the negative health and environmental impacts of overconsumption of meat.

Besides health risks, meat production also causes harm to the environment. Worldwide, agricultural activity, especially livestock production, accounts for about a fifth of total greenhouse gas emissions, thus contributing to climate change. Methane and nitrous oxide are strong greenhouse gases connected to livestock production, and they cause more warming in this sector than carbon dioxide (McMichael et al. 2007, 1254). Sabaté et al. studied the environmental costs of producing 1 kg of protein. The results showed that production of 1 kg of protein from beef required 18 times more land, 10 times more water, 9 times more fuel, 12 times more fertilizer, and 10 times more pesticides than the same amount of protein obtained from kidney beans (González et al. 2020, 2). The study indicates that producing beef places greater pressure on land and water. Another major problem is the water footprint of animal production. Globally, agriculture uses 92% of the world's freshwater, and 29% of this amount is used directly or indirectly for animal production. This means a large share of water resources is spent on livestock farming. Besides growing animal feed, water is also needed to prepare feed and provide drinking water for animals (Gerbens-Leenes, Mekonnen, and Hoekstra 2013, 26).

Methodology

This study employs a comparative approach to investigate the importance of government intervention in reducing the environmental and public health impacts of meat consumption. It focuses on two countries, Denmark and Brazil, to show the difference between a country with strong government policies and a country with limited regulation in this area. The aim is to understand whether government actions can reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve public health. The study compares how Denmark uses policies such as dietary guidelines and climate-related agricultural strategies, while Brazil has fewer direct policies aimed at reducing meat consumption or livestock emissions. This comparison helps to show the possible effects of government action and inaction.

Denmark, a meat-loving country, is selected as a case study because it has strong government policies aimed at reducing meat consumption and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG). Despite having a huge desire for meat, the Danish government is actively intervening in its population's meat-eating habits. The government agreed to cut GHG emissions by 70% by 2030 compared with 1990 levels. To achieve this goal, in 2021 the government published "The Official Danish Dietary Guidelines – good for health and climate", which not only guide Danes on how to eat healthier, but also on how to eat with a lower climate footprint (Trolle et al. 2022). The guidelines clearly recommend eating plant-rich foods, including more vegetables and fruits. If animal products are consumed, legumes and fish are suggested as more sustainable

alternatives. The guidelines also recommend eating wholegrain foods, vegetable oils and low-fat dairy (Danish Veterinary and Food Administration 2021). Additionally, as a major pork and dairy exporter, Denmark is planning to put a tax on livestock carbon dioxide emissions from 2030, making it the first country to do so and hoping to inspire others. Taxation Minister Jeppe Bruus said, "We will be the first country in the world to introduce a real CO₂ tax on agriculture. Other countries will be inspired by this" (Carlsson 2024).

As one of the largest meat-producing countries in the world, Brazil faces significant environmental and health challenges related to high levels of meat consumption and livestock-based GHG emissions. This makes Brazil an important case study for understanding how limited government intervention in meat consumption can influence environmental and health outcomes. Unlike Denmark, Brazil does not implement strong national dietary guidelines or targeted policies aimed at reducing meat consumption, despite having one of the largest livestock industries in the world. Normally, meat intake is 138 g for men and 81 g for women daily in Brazil. The Brazilian Ministry of Health recommends one serving of daily meat (100g) for a healthy diet, which is above the standard line (70g). That is why public health has been a concern in Brazil, as about 81% of men and 58% of women consume more meat than recommended (Carvalho et al. 2012). Cattle ranching is the main economic activity in Brazil, making the country one of the world's largest beef exporters. However, this sector of the economy is the second-largest emitter of GHG emissions in Brazil, due to handling animal waste and enteric fermentation by ruminant herbivores (the greatest source of methane emissions) (Carvalho et al. 2012). Despite causing such problems, the Brazilian government is not on track to reach either its 2025 target or its 2030 target (Climate Action Tracker 2024).

A challenge during this study was that it mainly focuses on secondary sources such as government reports, news and academic articles rather than primary sources, interviews and original field research. Additionally, the comparison focuses on only two countries, Denmark and Brazil, which may not represent the global situation regarding environmental policies on meat consumption. The two countries also differ in terms of economy and culture, which may influence the effectiveness of government intervention; finding two countries that are identical in other respects was not possible.

Another problem encountered during the research was lack of available data about GHG emissions before and after government intervention in Denmark. Many of these policies are still new, so there is not enough long-term data available yet. Because of this, the study mainly focuses on government actions and existing reports instead of detailed before-and-after emission statistics. At first, the research aimed to focus only on Denmark and compare emission levels from different time periods to see the direct impact of government policies. However, it was difficult to find enough clear and relevant statistical information for this comparison. Because of this, the study changed to a comparative approach between Denmark and Brazil in order to better discuss the role of government intervention in meat consumption and environmental policies.

Conclusion

This paper has examined the impact of excessive meat consumption on human health and the environment, with a particular focus on the role of government intervention. The findings show that high levels of meat consumption are linked to serious health risks such as cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, and certain types of cancer, while also contributing

significantly to environmental problems, including greenhouse gas emissions, land use pressure, and water consumption. The study highlights that livestock production is a major contributor to global emissions, and that dietary patterns play an important role in both public health and environmental sustainability.

This research contributes to the understanding of how governments can influence people's eating habits and also reduce environmental problems through policies. The comparison between Denmark and Brazil shows this clearly. Denmark shows how state intervention through dietary guidelines and plans such as a carbon tax on agriculture can encourage people to eat less meat and choose more plant-based food. This shows that government action can slowly change consumption patterns and reduce environmental impact. On the other hand, Brazil has weaker control over meat consumption, and because meat production is an important part of its economy, it is more difficult to reduce emissions from this sector. This shows that political decisions are important in balancing economic needs, health, and environmental protection.

Looking at this research, one positive aspect is that it helps to show how different government approaches can lead to different outcomes. By comparing Denmark and Brazil, it becomes easier to see how policy choices influence both meat consumption and environmental impact. The use of academic articles and official reports also helps to support the arguments with reliable information. At the same time, there are some limits to the study. It is mainly based on secondary sources such as reports and published research, rather than interviews or direct data collection. Also, only two countries were included in the comparison, which makes it harder to fully understand global differences. In addition, Denmark and Brazil are very different in terms of economy and culture, so the comparison is not always fully balanced.

For future research, it would be better to include more countries so that the picture is more complete about what is really happening in the world. It could also be useful to collect direct data from people, like surveys, to understand why meat consumption stays high even when people know about the health and environmental risks. Another important direction would be to follow up on countries like Denmark over a longer period of time, since many of its policies are still being implemented and their full impact will only be seen closer to 2050. Future studies could examine whether these measures actually turn out to be effective in reducing emissions and changing dietary habits, and if so, how other countries could also use similar ideas in their own systems.

“Влияние чрезмерного потребления мяса на здоровье человека и окружающую среду”

АННОТАЦИЯ

Данное исследование посвящено изучению влияния чрезмерного потребления мяса на здоровье человека и окружающую среду. Несмотря на то, что мясо является важным источником белка, железа и витамина B12, его избыточное употребление связано с повышенным риском сердечно-сосудистых заболеваний, сахарного диабета второго типа и некоторых видов рака. В работе также рассматриваются экологические последствия производства мяса, включая выбросы парниковых газов, высокое потребление водных ресурсов и интенсивное использование земель. На основе сравнительного подхода анализируется политика Дании и Бразилии с целью оценки

роли государственного вмешательства в решении данных проблем. Результаты показывают, что рекомендации по питанию и экологические меры способны снизить негативные последствия чрезмерного потребления мяса.

Ключевые слова: чрезмерное потребление мяса, общественное здоровье, выбросы парниковых газов, экологическая устойчивость, животноводство, государственное вмешательство, Дания, Бразилия, рекомендации по питанию.

ВВЕДЕНИЕ

С 1960-х годов потребление мяса во всем мире значительно увеличилось. Во многих странах мясо стало важной частью ежедневного рациона, однако растущий спрос вызывает серьезные опасения. Производство мяса является важным источником питательных веществ, необходимых для нормального роста и развития человека. Оно обеспечивает организм высококачественным белком, железом, витамином В12, витаминами группы В, цинком, селеном и фосфором.

Однако чрезмерное потребление мяса и насыщенных жиров способствует развитию сердечно-сосудистых заболеваний, сахарного диабета и некоторых видов онкологических заболеваний. Кроме того, сельское хозяйство обеспечивает около 22% мировых выбросов парниковых газов, а животноводство отвечает примерно за 80% выбросов этого сектора.

Несмотря на эти проблемы, предпочтение людей в пользу мяса остается практически неизменным. Это приводит к дальнейшему ухудшению состояния здоровья населения и окружающей среды. В результате перед государственными органами стоит задача поиска баланса между защитой природы и удовлетворением потребностей населения.

ОБЗОР ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

Человек на протяжении миллионов лет развивался как всеядный вид, поэтому мясо долгое время оставалось одним из основных источников энергии. Резкий отказ от мяса без его полноценной замены может привести к дефициту важных питательных веществ.

Специалисты рекомендуют употреблять около 70 граммов мяса в день. Превышение данной нормы может способствовать развитию диабета второго типа, рака и повышенного артериального давления. Тем не менее мировое потребление мяса увеличилось с 50 миллионов тонн в 1960 году до 300 миллионов тонн в 2010 году. Сегодня среднее мировое потребление составляет около 100 граммов мяса на человека в сутки.

Эти показатели свидетельствуют о том, что люди наносят вред своему здоровью из-за чрезмерного потребления мясных продуктов. Согласно рекомендациям комиссии EAT-Lancet, здоровый рацион должен включать умеренное количество рыбы и мяса птицы, а потребление красного мяса следует существенно ограничить.

В ответ на растущую обеспокоенность последствиями чрезмерного потребления мяса все большую популярность приобретают вегетарианские и растительные диеты. Исследования, проведенные в США, Канаде и Великобритании, показали, что основными причинами перехода к вегетарианству являются забота о здоровье, защита окружающей среды и благополучие животных.

Помимо негативного влияния на здоровье, производство мяса оказывает серьезное воздействие на окружающую среду. Во всем мире сельское хозяйство, особенно животноводство, обеспечивает около одной пятой всех выбросов парниковых газов и тем самым способствует изменению климата.

Метан и закись азота, связанные с животноводством, являются более мощными парниковыми газами, чем углекислый газ. Исследования показали, что производство одного килограмма белка из говядины требует в 18 раз больше земли, в 10 раз больше воды, в 9 раз больше топлива, в 12 раз больше удобрений и в 10 раз больше пестицидов по сравнению с производством такого же количества белка из фасоли.

Еще одной серьезной проблемой является водный след животноводства. Около 92% мировых запасов пресной воды используется в сельском хозяйстве, и примерно 29% этого объема связано с производством продукции животноводства. Вода необходима для выращивания кормов, приготовления кормовых смесей и поения животных.

МЕТОДОЛОГИЯ

В данном исследовании используется сравнительный подход для анализа значения государственного вмешательства в снижении экологических и медицинских последствий потребления мяса. В качестве примеров были выбраны Дания и Бразилия, что позволяет сравнить страну с активной государственной политикой и страну с ограниченным регулированием в данной сфере.

Основной целью исследования является определение того, способны ли государственные меры снижать выбросы парниковых газов и улучшать состояние общественного здоровья. Дания активно использует рекомендации по питанию и климатические стратегии в сельском хозяйстве, тогда как в Бразилии подобных мер значительно меньше.

ПРИМЕР ДАНИИ

Дания была выбрана в качестве примера благодаря активной политике по сокращению потребления мяса и снижению выбросов парниковых газов. Несмотря на высокий уровень потребления мясной продукции, правительство страны стремится изменить пищевые привычки населения.

Дания поставила цель сократить выбросы парниковых газов на 70% к 2030 году по сравнению с уровнем 1990 года. Для достижения этой цели в 2021 году были опубликованы официальные рекомендации по питанию, ориентированные одновременно на здоровье населения и защиту климата.

В рекомендациях подчеркивается необходимость увеличения потребления овощей, фруктов и растительной пищи. При употреблении продуктов животного происхождения предпочтение рекомендуется отдавать рыбе и бобовым культурам как более экологичным источникам питания.

Кроме того, Дания планирует ввести налог на выбросы углекислого газа в животноводстве, что может сделать ее первой страной в мире, применяющей подобную меру в сельском хозяйстве.

ПРИМЕР БРАЗИЛИИ

Бразилия является одним из крупнейших производителей мяса в мире. Поэтому страна сталкивается с серьезными экологическими и медицинскими проблемами,

связанными с высоким уровнем потребления мяса и значительными выбросами парниковых газов от животноводства.

В отличие от Дании, Бразилия не реализует масштабных государственных программ по сокращению потребления мяса. Среднесуточное потребление мяса составляет около 138 граммов среди мужчин и 81 грамм среди женщин, что превышает рекомендуемую норму.

Животноводство играет важную роль в экономике страны и делает Бразилию одним из крупнейших мировых экспортеров говядины. Однако данный сектор также является одним из крупнейших источников выбросов парниковых газов. III

ОГРАНИЧЕНИЯ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

Одним из ограничений исследования является использование преимущественно вторичных источников информации, таких как государственные отчеты, научные статьи и публикации в СМИ. Кроме того, анализ основан только на примере двух стран, что ограничивает возможность распространения выводов на глобальный уровень.

Также существуют трудности, связанные с недостатком долгосрочных данных о результатах государственных мер в Дании, поскольку многие из них были внедрены относительно недавно.

ЗАКЛЮЧЕНИЕ

Проведенное исследование показало, что чрезмерное потребление мяса оказывает значительное негативное влияние как на здоровье человека, так и на окружающую среду. Высокое потребление мяса связано с риском развития сердечно-сосудистых заболеваний, диабета и некоторых видов рака. Одновременно животноводство способствует увеличению выбросов парниковых газов, росту потребления воды и усилению нагрузки на земельные ресурсы.

Сравнение Дании и Бразилии демонстрирует важность государственной политики в решении данных проблем. Дания использует рекомендации по питанию и экологические меры для стимулирования более устойчивого потребления продуктов питания. В Бразилии же зависимость экономики от животноводства затрудняет реализацию подобных инициатив.

Таким образом, исследование подтверждает, что достижение баланса между общественным здоровьем, экономическими интересами и экологической устойчивостью требует активного участия государства. Будущие исследования могут включать большее количество стран, использовать данные опросов населения и анализировать долгосрочные результаты реализуемых политических мер.

“Go'shtni ortiqcha iste'mol qilishning inson salomatligi va atrof-muhitga ta'siri”

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu tadqiqot ortiqcha go'sht iste'molining inson salomatligi va atrof-muhitga ta'sirini o'rganadi. Go'sht oqsil, temir va B12 vitamini kabi muhim oziq moddalar manbai bo'lsa-da, uni me'yordan ortiq iste'mol qilish yurak-qon tomir kasalliklari, 2-toifa diabet va ayrim saraton turlari xavfini oshiradi. Tadqiqotda, shuningdek, go'sht ishlab chiqarishning ekologik oqibatlari, jumladan issiqxona gazlari chiqindilari, suv resurslarining ko'p sarflanishi va yer resurslaridan keng foydalanish masalalari tahlil qilinadi. Daniya va Braziliya misolida hukumat siyosatlari qiyosiy tahlil qilinib, davlat aralashuvining ushbu muammolarni hal etishdagi roli

baholanadi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, ovqatlanish bo'yicha tavsiyalar va ekologik siyosatlar go'sht iste'molining salbiy oqibatlarini kamaytirishga yordam beradi.

Kalit so'zlar: ortiqcha go'sht iste'moli, jamoat salomatligi, issiqxona gazlari chiqindilari, ekologik barqarorlik, chorvachilik, davlat aralashuvi, Daniya, Braziliya, ovqatlanish bo'yicha tavsiyalar.

KIRISH

1960-yillardan buyon go'sht iste'moli tez sur'atlarda oshib bormoqda. Ko'plab mamlakatlarda go'sht kundalik ratsionning muhim qismiga aylangan bo'lsa-da, unga bo'lgan talabning ortishi jiddiy muammolarni keltirib chiqarmoqda. Go'sht insonning normal o'sishi va rivojlanishi uchun zarur bo'lgan oziq moddalar manbai hisoblanadi. U yuqori sifatli oqsil, temir, B12 vitamini, B guruhi vitaminlari, rux, selen va fosfarga boydir.

Biroq go'sht va to'yingan yog'larni ortiqcha iste'mol qilish yurak-qon tomir kasalliklari, qandli diabet va ayrim saraton turlarining rivojlanishiga sabab bo'lishi mumkin. Shu bilan birga, qishloq xo'jaligi sohasi dunyo bo'yicha issiqxona gazlari chiqindilarining 22 foizini tashkil etadi. Chorvachilik esa ushbu chiqindilarning qariyb 80 foiziga sabab bo'ladi.

Shunga qaramay, odamlarning go'shtga bo'lgan talabi deyarli o'zgarmay qolmoqda. Bu esa inson salomatligi va atrof-muhitga yanada ko'proq zarar yetkazmoqda. Natijada siyosatchilar oldida tabiatni muhofaza qilish va aholining ehtiyojlarini qondirish o'rtasida muvozanat topish vazifasi turibdi.

ADABIYOTLAR TAHLILI

Insoniyat millionlab yillar davomida ham o'simlik, ham hayvon mahsulotlarini iste'mol qiluvchi mavjudot sifatida shakllangan. Shu sababli go'sht uzoq vaqt davomida asosiy energiya manbalaridan biri bo'lib kelgan. Ratsiondan go'shtni birdaniga chiqarib tashlash, agar uning o'rnini boshqa mahsulotlar bilan to'ldirilmasa, oziq moddalarning yetishmovchiligiga olib kelishi mumkin.

Mutaxassislar kuniga 70 gramm go'sht iste'mol qilishni tavsiya etadilar. Ushbu me'yordan ortiq iste'mol qilish 2-toifa diabet, saraton va yuqori qon bosimi xavfini oshiradi. Biroq dunyo bo'yicha go'sht iste'moli 1960-yildagi 50 million tonnadan 2010-yilda 300 million tonnagacha oshgan. Hozirgi kunda dunyo bo'yicha o'rtacha go'sht iste'moli bir kishi uchun kuniga 100 grammni tashkil qiladi.

Bu ko'rsatkichlar odamlar sog'lig'iga ortiqcha go'sht iste'moli orqali qanchalik zarar yetkazayotganini ko'rsatadi. EAT-Lancet komissiyasi tavsiyalariga ko'ra, sog'lom ratsion tarkibida dengiz mahsulotlari va parranda go'shti cheklangan miqdorda bo'lishi, qizil go'sht esa juda kam iste'mol qilinishi kerak.

Go'shtni ortiqcha iste'mol qilishning salbiy oqibatlari tufayli vegetarian va o'simlik asosidagi ovqatlanish usullari ommalashib bormoqda. AQSh, Kanada va Buyuk Britaniyada o'tkazilgan tadqiqotlar natijalariga ko'ra, odamlarning vegetarian bo'lishiga eng asosiy sabablar salomatlik, ekologiya va hayvonlar farovonligi bilan bog'liq masalalardir.

Salomatlikka ta'siridan tashqari, go'sht ishlab chiqarish atrof-muhitga ham jiddiy zarar yetkazadi. Dunyo miqyosida qishloq xo'jaligi faoliyati, ayniqsa chorvachilik, issiqxona gazlari chiqindilarining qariyb beshdan bir qismini tashkil etadi va iqlim o'zgarishiga sezilarli ta'sir ko'rsatadi. Chorvachilik bilan bog'liq metan va azot oksidi karbonat angidridga qaraganda kuchliroq issiqxona gazlari hisoblanadi.

Tadqiqotlar shuni ko'rsatadiki, 1 kilogramm mol go'shti oqsilini ishlab chiqarish uchun loviyadan olinadigan xuddi shu miqdordagi oqsilga nisbatan 18 baravar ko'p yer maydoni, 10 baravar ko'p suv, 9 baravar ko'p yoqilg'i, 12 baravar ko'p o'g'it va 10 baravar ko'p pestitsid talab qilinadi. Bu esa mol go'shti ishlab chiqarish yer va suv resurslariga juda katta bosim o'tkazishini ko'rsatadi.

Yana bir muhim muammo chorvachilikning suv izidir. Dunyodagi chuchuk suv resurslarining 92 foizi qishloq xo'jaligida foydalaniladi va uning qariyb 29 foizi bevosita yoki bilvosita chorvachilikka sarflanadi. Suv nafaqat yem-xashak yetishtirish, balki yem tayyorlash va hayvonlarni sug'orish uchun ham kerak bo'ladi.

METODOLOGIYA

Mazkur tadqiqot go'sht iste'molining salomatlik va atrof-muhitga ta'sirini kamaytirishda hukumat aralashuvining ahamiyatini aniqlash uchun qiyosiy usuldan foydalanadi. Tadqiqot Daniya va Braziliya misolida olib borilgan bo'lib, kuchli davlat siyosatiga ega mamlakat bilan ushbu yo'nalishda cheklangan siyosatga ega mamlakat o'rtasidagi farqlarni ko'rsatishga qaratilgan.

Tadqiqotning asosiy maqsadi hukumat siyosati issiqxona gazlari chiqindilarini kamaytirishi va jamoat salomatligini yaxshilashi mumkinligini aniqlashdan iborat. Daniya ovqatlanish bo'yicha ko'rsatmalar va iqlimga oid qishloq xo'jaligi strategiyalaridan foydalansa, Braziliyada go'sht iste'molini kamaytirishga qaratilgan aniq siyosatlar kamroq uchraydi. Ushbu taqqoslash hukumat harakati va harakatsizligining mumkin bo'lgan oqibatlarini ko'rsatishga yordam beradi.

DANIYA MISOLI

Daniya go'sht iste'moli yuqori bo'lishiga qaramay, issiqxona gazlari chiqindilarini kamaytirishga qaratilgan kuchli siyosat yuritayotgan mamlakat sifatida tanlangan. Daniya hukumati 2030-yilgacha issiqxona gazlari chiqindilarini 1990-yil darajasiga nisbatan 70 foizga qisqartirishni maqsad qilgan.

Ushbu maqsadga erishish uchun 2021-yilda "Sog'liq va iqlim uchun Daniya rasmiy ovqatlanish tavsiyalari" e'lon qilindi. Tavsiyalarda aholiga ko'proq sabzavot va mevalar iste'mol qilish, o'simlik mahsulotlariga boy ratsion tanlash tavsiya etiladi. Agar hayvon mahsulotlari iste'mol qilinsa, baliq va dukkakli mahsulotlar ekologik jihatdan barqarorroq variant sifatida ko'rsatiladi.

Bundan tashqari, Daniya 2030-yildan boshlab chorvachilikdan chiqadigan karbonat angidrid chiqindilariga soliq joriy etishni rejalashtirmoqda. Bu dunyoda qishloq xo'jaligiga real CO₂ solig'i joriy etayotgan birinchi davlat bo'lishi mumkin.

BRAZILIYA MISOLI

Braziliya dunyodagi eng yirik go'sht ishlab chiqaruvchi davlatlardan biri hisoblanadi. Shu sababli mamlakat yuqori go'sht iste'moli va chorvachilik bilan bog'liq issiqxona gazlari chiqindilari tufayli jiddiy ekologik va sog'liq muammolariga duch kelmoqda.

Daniyadan farqli ravishda, Braziliyada go'sht iste'molini kamaytirishga qaratilgan kuchli milliy siyosat mavjud emas. Mamlakatda erkaklar kuniga o'rtacha 138 gramm, ayollar esa 81 gramm go'sht iste'mol qiladi. Bu tavsiya etilgan 70 gramm me'yordan ancha yuqoridir.

Chorvachilik Braziliya iqtisodiyotining muhim tarmoqlaridan biri bo'lib, mamlakat dunyodagi eng yirik mol go'shti eksportchilaridan hisoblanadi. Shu bilan birga, ushbu sektor mamlakatdagi issiqxona gazlari chiqindilarining eng yirik manbalaridan biridir. Shunga

qaramay, Braziliya hukumati iqlim maqsadlariga erishish bo'yicha yetarli natijalarni ko'rsatayotgani yo'q.

TADQIQOT CHEKLOVLARI

Mazkur tadqiqot asosan ikkilamchi manbalarga, ya'ni hukumat hisobotlari, ilmiy maqolalar va yangiliklarga tayanadi. Birlamchi ma'lumotlar, intervyular va dala tadqiqotlari yetarli darajada qo'llanilmagan.

Bundan tashqari, tadqiqot faqat Daniya va Braziliya misollariga asoslangan. Ushbu mamlakatlar iqtisodiy va madaniy jihatdan bir-biridan sezilarli farq qiladi. Shu sababli natijalarni butun dunyo uchun umumlashtirish qiyin.

Yana bir muammo Daniyada hukumat siyosati joriy etilishidan oldingi va keyingi davrga oid yetarli statistik ma'lumotlarning mavjud emasligidir. Ko'plab siyosatlar yangi bo'lgani sababli ularning uzoq muddatli natijalari hali to'liq ko'rinmagan.

XULOSA

Mazkur tadqiqot ortiqcha go'sht iste'molining inson salomatligi va atrof-muhitga ta'sirini o'rganib chiqdi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, go'shtni me'yordan ortiq iste'mol qilish yurak-qon tomir kasalliklari, diabet va ayrim saraton turlari xavfini oshiradi. Shu bilan birga, chorvachilik issiqxona gazlari chiqindilari, yer resurslaridan ortiqcha foydalanish va suv iste'molining ortishiga sabab bo'ladi.

Daniya va Braziliya misollarini taqqoslash hukumat siyosatining ahamiyatini yaqqol ko'rsatadi. Daniya ovqatlanish bo'yicha tavsiyalar va ekologik soliqlar orqali aholini go'sht iste'molini kamaytirishga undamoqda. Braziliyada esa iqtisodiyotning chorvachilikka bog'liqligi sababli bunday siyosatlarni amalga oshirish murakkabroq hisoblanadi.

Tadqiqot shuni ko'rsatadiki, inson salomatligini saqlash va ekologik barqarorlikka erishish uchun hukumatlarning faol ishtiroki muhim ahamiyatga ega. Kelajakdagi tadqiqotlarda ko'proq mamlakatlarni qamrab olish, so'rovnomalar o'tkazish va siyosatlarning uzoq muddatli natijalarini tahlil qilish maqsadga muvofiq bo'ladi.

Adabiyotlar, References, Литературы:

1. Pereira, Paula Manuela de Castro Cardoso, and Ana Filipa dos Reis Baltazar Vicente. 2013. "Meat Nutritional Composition and Nutritive Role in the Human Diet." *Meat Science* 93, no. 3 (March): 586-592. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2012.09.018>
2. Walker, Polly, Pamela Rhubart-Berg, Shawn McKenzie, Kristin Kelling, and Robert S. Lawrence. "Public Health Implications of Meat Production and Consumption." *Public Health Nutrition* 8, no. 4 (June 2005): 348-356. <https://doi.org/10.1079/PHN2005727>.
3. McMichael, Anthony J., John W. Powles, Colin D. Butler, and Ricardo Uauy. 2007. "Food, Livestock Production, Energy, Climate Change, and Health." *The Lancet* 370, no. 9594 (October): 1253-1263. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(07\)61256-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61256-2)
4. Godfray, H. Charles J., Paul Aveyard, Tara Garnett, Jim W. Hall, Timothy J. Key, Jamie Lorimer, Ray T. Pierrehumbert, et al. "Meat Consumption, Health, and the Environment: The Future of Meat." *Science* 361, no. 6399 (July 2018): eaam5324. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aam5324>
5. National Health Service. "Meat in Your Diet." *Live Well*. Last modified June 16, 2022.
6. <https://www.nhs.uk/live-well/eat-well/food-types/meat-nutrition/>.
7. Willett, Walter, Johan Rockström, Brent Loken, Marco Springmann, Tim Lang, Sonja

- Vermeulen, Tara Garnett, et al. "Food in the Anthropocene: The EAT-Lancet Commission on Healthy Diets from Sustainable Food Systems." *Lancet* 393, no. 10170 (2019): 447–492.
8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31788-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4).
 9. Fox, Nick, and Katie Ward. 2008. "Health, Ethics and Environment: A Qualitative Study of Vegetarian Motivations." *Appetite* 50, no. 2–3 (March–May): 422–429.
 10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2007.09.007>
 11. González, Neus, Montse Marquès, Martí Nadal, and José L. Domingo. 2020. "Meat Consumption: Which are the Current Global Risks? A Review of Recent (2010–2020) Evidences." *Food Research International* 137 (November): 109341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2020.109341>.
 12. Gerbens-Leenes, P. W., M. M. Mekonnen, and A. Y. Hoekstra. 2013. "The Water Footprint of Poultry, Pork and Beef: A Comparative Study in Different Countries and Production Systems." *Water Resources and Industry* 1–2 (March–June): 25–36.
 13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wri.2013.03.001>.
 14. Trolle, Ellen, Matilda Nordman, Anne Dahl Lassen, Tracey A. Colley, and Lisbeth Mogensen. 2022. "Carbon Footprint Reduction by Transitioning to a Diet Consistent with the Danish Climate-Friendly Dietary Guidelines: A Comparison of Different Carbon Footprint Databases." *Foods* 11, no. 8: 1119. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods11081119>
 15. Danish Veterinary and Food Administration. 2021. "The Official Dietary Guidelines – Good for Health and Climate." Last modified January 7, 2021. <https://en.fvm.dk/the-officialdietary-guidelines/>.
 16. Carlsson, Isabelle Yr. 2024. "Denmark Will Be First to Impose CO2 Tax on Farms, Government Says." *Reuters*, June 25, 2024. <https://www.reuters.com/business/environment/denmark-impose-co2-tax-agriculture-202406-25/>
 17. Carvalho, Aline Martins de, Chester Luiz Galvão César, Regina Mara Fisberg, and Dirce Maria Lobo Marchioni. 2012. "Excessive Meat Consumption in Brazil: Diet Quality and Environmental Impacts." *Public Health Nutrition* 16, no. 10 (August): 1893–99. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S136898001200384X>
 18. Climate Action Tracker. 2024. "Brazil: Country Summary." <https://climateactiontracker.org/countries/brazil/>.