From Pasture to Plate - Navigating the New Legal Feudalism

How EID Mandates and "Moral" State Laws Are Redefining the Business of Agriculture

Roger McEowen (roger.mceowen@washburn.edu) – Washburn University School of Law
Ag Law and Taxation Blog: https://agriculturallaw.lawprofessorsblogs.com/
March 2026

Overview

The first quarter of 2026 has been a watershed moment for agricultural and food law, signaling a shift in the tectonic plates of our constitutional order. From the mandatory digital tracking of individual livestock to the specific moral and scientific phrasing required on a retail label, the legal infrastructure governing our food system is undergoing a massive architectural overhaul.

In this article, I analyze three major developments that are redefining the boundaries of the American food market:

- **The Check on Federal Administrative Power**: How the EID mandate is testing the limits of agency authority in the wake of the *Loper Bright* era.
- **The Commercial Speech Doctrine:** How state attempts to "socially engineer" consumer choices through labeling mandates are clashing with the First Amendment.
- **The "Moral Market" and the Balkanization of Trade:** How the expansion of "extraterritorial" state regulations is effectively dismantling the unified national market the Framers intended to protect through the Commerce Clause.

Ultimately, we are moving toward a fractured "patchwork" of state food laws. For producers, the cost of doing business is no longer determined solely by feed, fuel, and weather; it is increasingly a matter of navigating the differing legal philosophies of every state line they cross.**The Legal Standing: A "Time-Limited" Window**

The EID Mandate: Efficiency or Encroachment?

In *R-CALF USA, et al. v. USDA*[1], a South Dakota federal court is currently weighing a motion for summary judgment that groups representing cattlemen filed on March 5, 2026. Previously, the court issued an order denying the USDA's motion to dismiss and allowed the "arbitrary and capricious" claims to move forward[2]. At the heart of the case is the USDA's mandate requiring Electronic Identification (EID) ear tags for cattle and bison moving across state lines.

[1] Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment – Ranchers-Cattlemen Action Legal Fund United Stockgrowers of America v. United States Department of Agriculture, USA v. USDA, No. 5:24-cv-05085 (D. S.D. Mar. 5, 2026).
[2] Ranchers-Cattlemen Action Legal Fund United Stockgrowers of America v. United States Department of Agriculture, No. 5:24-CV-05085-ECS, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 195546 (D. S.D. Sept. 30, 2025).

The plaintiffs, a coalition of ranchers and advocacy groups, are wielding the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) as their primary weapon. Their argument is two-pronged:

- **Unauthorized Mandate**: They argue the USDA exceeded its statutory authority by replacing a functional, low-cost visual tagging system with a $3-per-head electronic requirement.

- **Arbitrary and Capricious:** This is the "logic gap" in the rule. Plaintiffs point out that while the USDA mandates the *tags*, it doesn't mandate the *readers*. This creates a scenario where ranchers pay for high-tech hardware only to have the data recorded manually—the exact process the rule claimed to modernize.

Note: The plaintiffs claim that the USDA rule is arbitrary and capricious because it mandates a specific high-cost technology (EID tags) without requiring the corresponding electronic readers. They contend this makes the rule "all hat and no cattle" - forcing an expensive mandate on producers that provides no actual scientific or data-gathering benefit over the existing visual-tag system.

If the court finds the USDA failed to provide "reasoned decision-making" or ignored less burdensome alternatives, the rule could be vacated. This case is a bellwether for how much "deference" agencies will receive in the post-*Loper Bright*[3] era, where courts are more skeptical of broad agency interpretations.

The Battle of the Labels: Compelled Speech in Texas

In Texas, the "Make Texas Healthy Again" Act[4] hit a major roadblock in February 2026. The U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas issued a preliminary injunction, signaling that the law is likely unconstitutional.[5]

SB 25 required warning labels on products containing certain ingredients (targeting additives common in plant-based and synthetic meats). The court's decision rested on the doctrine of Compelled Commercial Speech.

- **The Zauderer[6] Standard:** Generally, the government can force companies to disclose "purely factual and uncontroversial" information (like calorie counts).

- **The Ruling:** The court found that Texas was forcing companies to adopt a "government-scripted message" that was neither neutral nor purely factual. By requiring a warning for ingredients approved by the FDA but "not recommended" by foreign authorities, the law arguably misled consumers rather than informing them.

[3] 603 U.S. 639 (2024).
[4] SB 25.
[5] American Beverage Association v. Paxton, No. 6:25-CV-00566-ADA-DTG, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30907 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 11, 2026).
[6] Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel, 471 U.S. 626 (1985).

The "Proposition 12" Ripple Effect: Massachusetts Question 3

The First Circuit Court of Appeals recently upheld Massachusetts' Question 3, a law that mirrors California's Proposition 12.[7] It prohibits the sale of pork, eggs, or veal in the state unless the animals were raised with specific space requirements.

The pork producers' legal challenge hinged on the Dormant Commerce Clause - the idea that states cannot pass laws that unduly burden interstate commerce.

- **The Precedent:** The court leaned heavily on the Supreme Court's 2023 ruling in *National Pork Producers Council v. Ross.*[8]
- **The "Even-Handed" Test:** Because Question 3 applies to *all* pork sold in Massachusetts—regardless of whether it was raised in-state or in Iowa—it isn't considered "discriminatory" on its face.
- **The "Moral" Market:** The ruling reinforces a powerful legal reality: states have the right to regulate the *moral* and *health* quality of the products sold within their borders, even if those regulations force out-of-state producers to change their entire business models.

Observation: The ruling effectively "Balkanizes" the national economy.[9] The Framers designed the Commerce Clause specifically to prevent a patchwork of conflicting state regulations that would stifle a national economy. By allowing Massachusetts to dictate how an Iowa farmer raises a hog, the First Circuit is allowing one state to project its "moral" preferences onto the citizens of another. When a state's "moral" regulation forces a total overhaul of out-of-state business models, it ceases to be a local health/safety measure and becomes an unconstitutional regulation of commerce occurring wholly outside its borders.[10] By framing this as a "right to regulate morality," the First Circuit is arguably extending Ross further than the Supreme Court intended, moving toward a regime where "local sentiment" can override national economic stability.

[7] Triumph Foods, LLC v. Campbell, 156 F. 4th 29 (1st Cir. 2025).

[8] 598 U.S. 356 (2023). *Ross* was a 5-4 decision with multiple fragmented concurrences. Justice Gorsuch's lead opinion did not give states a blank check for "moral" regulation; rather, it emphasized that the petitioners hadn't sufficiently alleged a "substantial burden" on interstate commerce under existing precedents.

[9] It also this effectively renders the *Pike* test a "dead letter." Pike v. Bruce Church, 397 U.S. 137 (1970). If a state can claim a "moral" benefit, no amount of economic data from out-of-state producers (e.g., the cost of retrofitting barns or the loss of national supply chain efficiency) will ever be "clearly excessive" enough to tip the scales

[10] True federalism means Massachusetts regulates Massachusetts, and Iowa regulates Iowa. Under the "Moral Market" logic, the "State's Rights" of the consumer state (Massachusetts) are being used to annihilate the "State's Rights" of the producer state (Iowa) to set its own agricultural policy. This creates a "race to the top" (or bottom) where the largest or most aggressive consumer states become the de facto national regulators, bypassing Congress and the USDA entirely.

What's Next on the Docket?

While Massachusetts and California have secured wins, Florida is the next frontier. A federal judge recently allowed a challenge to Florida's "cultivated meat" ban to proceed, specifically focusing on whether the ban discriminates against interstate commerce.[11]

Conclusion

The current trajectory of food law suggests we are departing from a unified national market and entering an era of regulatory feudalism. For decades, the "Commerce Clause" served as a shield, ensuring that a producer in the Midwest could reach consumers in New England without navigating a labyrinth of conflicting state ideologies. That shield is thinning.

The cases in South Dakota, Texas, and Massachusetts reveal a dangerous pincer movement:

- **From the Top:** Federal agencies like the USDA are testing the limits of their mandate, attempting to impose high-cost technological requirements (EID) that arguably lack both statutory clarity and practical logic.

- **From the Sides:** Aggressive state legislatures are leveraging their market size to project "moral" and "social" preferences across state lines. When Massachusetts dictates the square footage of a barn in Iowa, or Texas attempts to stigmatize FDA-approved ingredients, they are effectively disenfranchising the voters and legislatures of their sister states.

The cumulative result is a fractured "patchwork" of food laws that creates a massive compliance tax. For the modern producer, the cost of doing business is no longer determined solely by feed, fuel, and weather; it is increasingly dictated by the "legal alpha" required to navigate a landscape where state borders have become ideological barriers.

If the courts continue to prioritize "local moral sentiment" over national economic stability, the very concept of a "United" States commerce system may soon be a relic of the past. Producers must prepare for a bifurcated future where they either produce for the national commodity market or tailor their entire operations to the specific "moral" mandates of the most litigious coastal states.

For more information about this publication and others, visit AgManager.info.
K-State Agricultural Economics | 342 Waters Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506-4011 | www.agecononomics.k-state.edu

[11] Upside Foods, Inc. v. Simpson, Case No.: 4:24cv316-MW/MAF, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 85699 (N.D. Fla. Apr. 25, 2025).