



Written by [James Murphy](#) on November 7, 2018

Oxford Study Pushes Tax on Meat to Promote “Good Health”

Oxford University researchers at the Nuffield Department of Population Health (NDPH) are proposing a new “meat tax,” which they claim could save thousands of British citizens per year. The new tax would nearly double the cost of processed meat and raise the price of a steak by 14 percent.

The [study](#), published in the Public Library of Science One, claims that the new tax would save the lives of approximately 6,000 British citizens annually, as well as save Great Britain’s National Health Service (NHS) more than one billion pounds each year. Globally, the study claims that more than 220,000 lives per year could be saved if all countries adopted similar “meat taxes.”



The globalist [World Health Organization \(WHO\)](#), which is the UN’s healthcare bureaucracy, has previously categorized processed meat containing beef, pork, and lamb as carcinogenic and lists unprocessed forms of those meats as “probably [carcinogenic].”

Lead researcher Dr. Marco Springmann of Oxford claimed, “Nobody wants governments to tell people what they can and can’t eat.”

No, they just want to tax staple food products out of many consumer’s ability to purchase those items.

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

“I hope that governments will consider introducing a healthy levy on red and processed meat as part of a range of measures to make healthy and sustainable decision-making easier for consumers,” Springmann said.

There’s that word again: sustainable. The word is explicitly linked to the United Nation’s [Agenda 21](#) program.

“A health levy on red and processed meat would not limit choices, but send a powerful signal to consumers and take pressure off our healthcare systems,” Springmann said. The researchers liken such a tax to levies on cigarettes and alcohol, luxury items which have also been linked to cancer.

The researchers found that such a tax would reduce consumers’ portions of processed meat such as bacon and sausages by two servings per week in Britain.

The NDPH is the same group that pushed for the [“sugar tax”](#) in Great Britain, which went into effect last April. The “sugar tax” was sold as a measure that will help prevent childhood obesity in Great Britain.

Tam Fry, chairman of Britain’s National Obesity Forum, sang the praises of the proposed new meat tax.



Written by [James Murphy](#) on November 7, 2018

“When the sugar levy was first announced, people sucked their teeth and argued that it was an infringement of their human rights,” Fry noted. “But as the noise died down people began to realize that they had a real choice and that switching to something more healthy was a good thing.”

A meat tax, Fry argued, would do the same thing. “I see no reason why if sensibly introduced the same thing can’t work with meat. Clearly cutting down on red and processed meat is far healthier and also much better for the environment as raising a cow takes a huge amount of natural resources.”

It should be noted that the lead researcher, Springmann, is one of the same researchers who, just last month, urged a worldwide switch to a [more vegetarian diet](#) in an effort to forestall so-called climate change. In that study, published in the journal *Nature*, Springmann argued that the entire world needed to drastically reduce its intake of meat as both a hedge against climate change and a means to feed to the Earth’s growing population.

“It’s pretty shocking,” Springmann said of that study. “We are really risking the sustainability of the whole system. If we are interested in people being able to farm and eat, then we better not do that.”

There’s the sustainable word again.

Great Britain is not the only place such a tax is being considered. [In Denmark, a similar tax is also](#) on the table, not for public health reasons, but because of “ethical reasons” connected to the alleged contribution of livestock farming to greenhouse gases, which some believe contribute to global warming.

It’s very clear that this study is Agenda 21-driven and is using health and healthcare costs as the “logical reasons” such taxes should be levied. No one in the United States is yet talking publicly about such a tax but it’s definitely on the radar of U.S. globalists and nanny-staters.

The globalists don’t look only to restrict your right to own a gun or to speak your mind. They also want to control what you eat.

Photo: [Clipart.com](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.