# Government neglect endangers UK farming’s future, echoing Titanic’s peril



The tragic sinking of the RMS Titanic serves as a powerful metaphor for contemporary issues in UK agriculture, highlighted by the urgent need for enhanced food and environmental security. In the aftermath of the disaster, recommendations mandated sufficient lifeboat capacity for all aboard. However, the Titanic had only enough lifeboats for half of those on board, not due to overconfidence in her unsinkability, but because legal standards had not yet caught up with the potential repercussions of neglect. Today, we stand at a similar inflection point in our agricultural policies, where the risks posed by governmental neglect threaten both our capacity to feed ourselves and the vitality of our ecosystem.

As echoed by many within the agricultural community, including myself, there is a pressing need for proactive governance. The lessons from the past should drive us to safeguard our agricultural sector against the threats of neglect and underfunding. Increasingly, the fragility of our food systems mirrors historical lessons, as echoed by the warnings of past crises when strategic planning was absent. The parallels to the 1930s are stark; an era marked by a government unprepared for the twin challenges of conflict and food security, leading to calls for a more resilient approach.

Recent developments suggest that the government's current trajectory may hinder rather than help. Alistair Carmichael, chair of Parliament's environment committee, has criticised a fragmented approach within the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, pointing to ongoing protests from farmers against harsh financial reforms like the proposed inheritance tax on agricultural land. These reforms could generate substantial revenue for the Treasury, estimated at £500 million annually by the late 2020s, yet they risk alienating a key stakeholder in the nation’s food production ecosystem.

Moreover, the government’s framework for land use faces scrutiny from the farming community, which fears that shifting vast areas of farmland toward rewilding and biofuel production could leave the UK more reliant on imported food. Current estimates indicate that to meet climate targets, nearly 10% of English farmland will need repurposing—about 760,000 hectares. These ambitious targets, while necessary, are met with resistance from those within the sector who feel that their livelihoods are now at the mercy of bureaucratic overreach.

Contrary to the government's passive approach, the agricultural community is prepared to collaborate in addressing these dual crises of food and environmental security. Initiatives like Environmental Land Management schemes, while aimed at incentivising sustainable farming practices, have sparked concern that they could inadvertently constrict food production. The emphasis on ecological services must be balanced with the imperative of ensuring food self-sufficiency.

The view that environmental management and agricultural productivity are mutually exclusive is increasingly being challenged. There is a growing recognition, exemplified in transformative projects such as those on the Rothbury Estate, that aligning ecological restoration with agricultural practices can produce benefits for both farmers and the environment. Under the right conditions, farmers could be compensated for their contributions to conservation, fostering a spirit of partnership rather than confrontation. However, existing policies appear disconnected from the reality on the ground, leading to calls for a more coherent and integrated strategy that prioritises food security alongside environmental objectives.

With history as a backdrop and crisis as our current reality, the plea to the government is clear: engage with farmers in meaningful dialogue and adopt a collaborative approach. A sustainable future cannot be realised through unilateral decisions disconnected from those who will implement them. There exists a rare opportunity not just to avert impending crises, but to create a legacy of collaboration and success, transforming current challenges into a precedent we can all be proud of.
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