ISSN 2978-5111

Journal on Political Sciences & International Relations

SCIENTIFIC Research and Community

Review Article

Open Access

Palm Oil, Environmental Objectivity, and the Political Economy of Trade Discrimination: A Review of International Hypocrisy in Agricultural Trade Policy

Loso Judijanto

IPOSS Jakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This qualitative literature review examines the paradoxical treatment of palm oil in international trade policy, where the most land-efficient and productive vegetable oil faces disproportionate regulatory scrutiny compared to less efficient alternatives. Through thematic analysis of peer-reviewed literature published between 2020 and 2025, this study synthesizes evidence demonstrating palm oil's superior biophysical characteristics—including yields of 3.3-4.0 tons per hectare (8-10 times higher than soybean, rapeseed, or sunflower) and significant carbon sequestration capacity of 64.5 tons CO2/ha/year—while revealing how environmental narratives mask protectionist motivations. The analysis critically evaluates the European Union's Renewable Energy Directive II (RED II) as a discriminatory instrument that selectively classifies palm oil as "high ILUC-risk" while exempting European-produced oilseeds, despite objective life cycle assessment data indicating palm oil's lower overall environmental impact. Drawing on World Trade Organization dispute proceedings (DS593, DS600) and extensive empirical research, this review demonstrates that international palm oil discrimination constitutes environmental hypocrisy, driven primarily by economic interests protecting domestic farmers in importing countries rather than genuine sustainability concerns. The study concludes with policy recommendations calling for the enforcement of strict, crop-neutral trade standards based on land-use efficiency to dismantle green neocolonialism, alongside the establishment of a transnational framework that institutionalizes scientific objectivity in global vegetable oil governance.

***Corresponding author**

Loso Judijanto, IPOSS Jakarta, Indonesia.

Received: December 27, 2025; **Accepted:** January 01, 2026; **Published:** January 10, 2026

Keywords: Palm Oil, Trade Discrimination, Environmental Hypocrisy, EU RED II, Land Use Efficiency, Carbon Sequestration, WTO Disputes, Sustainability Standards

JEL Classification : Q17, Q56, F13, F18, O13, Q01

Introduction

Background: The Palm Oil Paradox

The global discourse surrounding palm oil represents one of the most striking contradictions in contemporary agricultural and environmental policy. Palm oil (Elaeis guineensis) accounts for approximately 40% of global vegetable oil production while occupying merely 7% of the land dedicated to oil crops, demonstrating unparalleled land-use efficiency and positioning it as a cornerstone of sustainable food systems. However, rather than receiving recognition for this extraordinary productivity, palm oil has become the most vilified agricultural commodity in international trade, subjected to regulatory restrictions, import bans, and sustainability criteria that far exceed those applied to alternative oilseeds [1-2].

This paradox becomes more pronounced when examining objective biophysical data. Average palm oil yields of 3.3-4.0 tons per hectare dramatically outperform soybean (0.47 t/ha), rapeseed (0.74 t/ha), and sunflower (0.78 t/ha), making palm oil 8-10 times more productive than its primary competitors. This productivity advantage translates directly into environmental benefits: replacing palm oil with alternative crops would require an additional 204-385 million hectares of agricultural land, inevitably driving deforestation and biodiversity loss that would far exceed current palm oil-related impacts. Furthermore, mature oil palm plantations function as net carbon sinks, sequestering approximately 64.5 tons of CO2 per hectare annually—exceeding the carbon storage capacity of many tropical forest ecosystems [3-5].

Despite these objective advantages, palm oil faces systematic discrimination in key export markets. The European Union's Renewable Energy Directive II (RED II) exemplifies this bias, classifying palm oil as a "high-risk" feedstock for biofuel due to concerns about indirect land-use change (ILUC) while granting preferential treatment to domestically produced rapeseed and sunflower oils that demonstrate inferior environmental performance. This selective regulatory approach raises fundamental questions about the relationship between scientific evidence and trade policy, suggesting that ecological narratives may serve as convenient justifications for economic protectionism rather than genuine sustainability objectives [6].

Research Urgency: The Cost of Discrimination

The urgency of addressing palm oil discrimination extends beyond academic debate to encompass significant economic, social, and environmental consequences. The World Trade Organization (WTO) disputes initiated by Indonesia (DS593) and Malaysia (DS600) against EU palm oil restrictions have partially validated claims of discriminatory treatment, with WTO panels acknowledging that RED II measures treat palm oil less favorably than other

vegetable oils. However, the continued implementation of these policies despite objective evidence of palm oil's superior efficiency suggests that international trade governance struggles to reconcile environmental objectives with principles of non-discrimination and scientific integrity [7].

The economic impact of discriminatory policies falls disproportionately on smallholder farmers, who cultivate approximately 41% of Indonesia's oil palm plantations and represent 16 million livelihoods across Southeast Asia. Research demonstrates that smallholder welfare correlates directly with palm oil productivity, with welfare indices showing 0.910 correlation coefficients with yield levels. Discriminatory trade measures that depress palm oil prices or restrict market access, therefore, translate directly into reduced incomes, diminished food security, and limited investment capacity for sustainable agricultural practices among the world's most vulnerable rural populations [8].

Simultaneously, the environmental costs of discrimination against palm oil remain poorly understood by policymakers and consumers. Life cycle assessment (LCA) studies consistently demonstrate that palm oil's greenhouse gas emissions per ton of product (1.52-1.87 kg CO_2-eq/kg) are comparable to or lower than alternative oils, particularly when accounting for land-use change impacts. The failure to incorporate productivity metrics into sustainability standards creates perverse incentives: policies intended to reduce environmental impact may actually increase global deforestation by promoting less efficient oil crops that require substantially more land [9].

Research Objectives

This qualitative literature review pursues four primary objectives: First, to synthesize empirical evidence demonstrating palm oil's objective environmental advantages over other vegetable oils across multiple dimensions, including land-use efficiency, carbon sequestration, and life cycle environmental impacts.

Second, to analyze the disconnect between scientific evidence on palm oil's sustainability performance and the policy narratives that frame it as uniquely environmentally destructive, and to identify mechanisms through which objective data is marginalized in political discourse.

Third, to examine the protectionist motivations underlying international palm oil discrimination, particularly the role of European agricultural interests in shaping regulatory frameworks that protect domestic rapeseed and sunflower producers from competition with more efficient Southeast Asian palm oil.

Fourth, to develop policy recommendations that promote science-based, non-discriminatory sustainability standards that recognize palm oil's contributions to global food security and environmental sustainability.

Literature Review

Conceptual Foundation: Palm Oil's Biophysical Superiority

Productivity per Hectare: An Unmatched Advantage

The most fundamental advantage of palm oil lies in its extraordinary productivity per unit area. Comprehensive meta-analyses of global yield data reveal that oil palm consistently produces 3.3-4.0 tons of crude palm oil per hectare annually, with best-in-class plantations achieving yields exceeding 6 tons/ha. This productivity stands in stark contrast to annual oilseed crops: soybean averages 0.47 t/ha, rapeseed 0.74 t/ha, and sunflower 0.78 t/ha, making palm oil 7-9 times more productive than its nearest competitors [3].

This productivity differential has profound implications for global land use. Our World in Data analysis demonstrates that producing the same quantity of vegetable oil from soybeans would require 2.1 hectares for every 0.3 hectares under oil palm cultivation—a sevenfold increase in land requirement [10]. Similarly, replacing palm oil with rapeseed would demand 1.4 hectares per ton, while sunflower requires 1.3 hectares. These differences become particularly significant when considering global vegetable oil demand, which has grown at 4-5% annually over the past two decades [11].

The perennial nature of the oil palm further enhances its productivity advantage. Unlike annual crops requiring annual tillage, planting, and establishment, oil palm produces continuously for 25-30 years after a one-time establishment period. This characteristic reduces not only direct land requirements but also the environmental costs associated with annual soil disturbance, including carbon emissions from soil organic matter decomposition and erosion risks from repeated cultivation [12].

Land Use Efficiency and Global Deforestation Dynamics

The relationship between palm oil production and global deforestation requires a nuanced analysis that accounts for counterfactual scenarios. While oil palm expansion has historically been accused of contributing to tropical deforestation, particularly in Indonesia and Malaysia during the 1990s and 2000s, the commodity's superior productivity means that palm oil-driven land use change replaces substantially less forest than would be required to meet the same oil demand through alternative crops [13].

Recent research shows that if global vegetable oil demand were met with soybean oil rather than palm oil, deforestation would increase by 204-385 million hectares worldwide, with particularly severe impacts in South America's Cerrado and Amazon biomes [14]. This counterfactual analysis reveals that palm oil's high productivity actually saves forests by concentrating oil production on smaller land areas. Furthermore, the study finds that palm oil-related deforestation has declined dramatically since 2012, with 2020 deforestation rates 90% lower than peak levels, while soybean-driven deforestation in Brazil has accelerated [15].

The land-sparing potential of palm oil extends beyond simple hectare comparisons. Oil palm cultivation occurs primarily on previously logged or degraded forest lands, mineral soils, and former agricultural areas, while soybean expansion frequently converts high-conservation-value native grasslands and forests. This distinction matters significantly for biodiversity and carbon outcomes, as oil palm on degraded lands can deliver substantial climate benefits through carbon sequestration while meeting oil demand with minimal additional forest conversion [16].

Life Cycle Environmental Impact Assessment

Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) provides comprehensive frameworks for evaluating environmental impacts across entire production chains, from cultivation through processing to final use. Comparative LCA studies consistently demonstrate palm oil's favorable environmental profile when productivity is appropriately accounted for in functional units [17].

A landmark comparative LCA published in the Journal of Cleaner Production analyzed five major vegetable oils using consistent methodology and found that palm oil's greenhouse gas emissions per kilogram of oil (1.52-1.87 kg CO2-eq/kg) were comparable to rapeseed (1.68-2.15 kg CO2-eq/kg) and substantially lower

than soybean (2.34-2.87 kg CO2-eq/kg) when including land-use change impacts. The study attributed palm oil's advantage to higher yields, lower fertilizer requirements per ton of oil, and the utilization of processing residues for energy generation [18].

Water consumption and eutrophication potential—critical environmental indicators often overlooked in public discourse also favor palm oil. Oil palm requires 2,000-3,000 liters of water per ton of oil, compared to 4,500-6,000 liters for soybean and 3,500-5,000 liters for rapeseed. Similarly, nitrogen runoff and eutrophication potential per functional unit are 30-40% lower for palm oil due to efficient nutrient cycling in plantation systems and lower input requirements per ton of output [19].

The processing stage further enhances palm oil's environmental performance. Palm oil mills generate substantial quantities of biomass residues (empty fruit bunches, palm kernel shells, mesocarp fibers) that can be combusted to generate renewable energy, offsetting fossil fuel consumption and reducing net emissions by 53-63% in integrated operations. This circular economy approach contrasts sharply with soybean and rapeseed processing, which rely heavily on fossil fuel-based energy and generate fewer usable byproducts [20-21].

Theoretical Foundation: International Hypocrisy and Trade Protectionism

Environmental Hypocrisy Theory

Environmental hypocrisy theory provides a framework for understanding how actors profess environmental principles while pursuing actions that contradict those principles, driven by economic or political interests. This concept, developed in the organizational studies and international relations literature, applies directly to palm oil governance, where importing countries deploy environmental rhetoric to justify trade restrictions that protect domestic agricultural sectors [22].

The mechanism of environmental hypocrisy involves three key elements: (1) public commitment to environmental principles, (2) selective application of those principles to target specific actors or commodities, and (3) exemption of domestic interests from equivalent standards. EU palm oil policy exemplifies this pattern, as RED II imposes stringent ILUC-risk criteria on palm oil while granting rapeseed and sunflower crops with demonstrably lower environmental performance—automatic compliance status [23].

Critical discourse analysis reveals that anti-palm oil campaigns frequently rely on emotional appeals and moral panic rather than scientific evidence. Imagery of orangutans and burning forests dominates public communications, while data on palm oil's superior land-use efficiency and carbon sequestration capacity remain marginalized in policy discussions. This selective framing suggests that environmental concerns serve as "linguistic packaging" for economic protectionism, particularly given that European rapeseed and sunflower farmers face significant competitive pressure from more efficient Southeast Asian palm oil producers [24].

Trade Protectionism Framework

The WTO legal framework provides tools for analyzing discriminatory measures in palm oil policy. GATT Article III:4 requires that imported products receive treatment "no less favorable" than that accorded to domestic products. At the same time, the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreement mandates that technical regulations not be more trade-restrictive than necessary to achieve legitimate objectives [6].

EU RED II measures appear to violate these principles through several mechanisms. First, the high ILUC-risk classification applies exclusively to palm oil, despite evidence that soybean, rapeseed, and sunflower also generate significant ILUC impacts when expanded. Second, the methodology for calculating ILUC risk remains opaque and has not been applied consistently across commodities, suggesting arbitrary discrimination. Third, the 7% cap on palm oil-based biofuels and the 2030 phase-out timeline effectively exclude palm oil from renewable energy markets while allowing unlimited use of domestic European oilseeds [25].

WTO panel proceedings in DS593 and DS600 partially confirmed these concerns, finding that EU measures treat palm oil less favorably than other vegetable oils and that the ILUC-risk assessment methodology lacks scientific transparency. However, the panel ultimately upheld the measures' environmental justification, highlighting the tension between trade law and unilateral ecological regulation in the absence of multilateral sustainability standards [26].

Global Power Dynamics and South-South Solidarity

The palm oil dispute reflects broader North-South tensions in global agricultural governance, in which developed countries use regulatory power to impose standards that protect domestic industries while constraining developing country exports. This dynamic exemplifies "green colonialism," in which Northern environmental preferences override Southern development priorities and context-specific sustainability solutions [27].

Indonesia and Malaysia have responded through the Council of Palm Oil Producing Countries (CPOPC), established in 2015 to coordinate policy responses and promote joint advocacy. This South-South cooperation represents a strategic shift from individual country complaints to collective bargaining, challenging the asymmetry in standard-setting power. CPOPC initiatives include joint research on palm oil's climate benefits, coordinated WTO litigation, and the development of alternative markets in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East [28].

The palm oil dispute thus transcends a single commodity conflict and becomes emblematic of broader struggles for equitable representation in global environmental governance. Developing countries argue that sustainability standards should account for productivity, efficiency, and development impacts rather than applying arbitrary thresholds that protect Northern agricultural interests while undermining Southern rural livelihoods [29].

Methodology

Qualitative Literature Review Approach

This study employs a qualitative literature review methodology, distinct from systematic reviews that follow rigid protocols for exhaustive literature identification and statistical meta-analysis. Qualitative reviews prioritize depth, contextual understanding, and theoretical synthesis over comprehensive coverage, making them appropriate for examining complex policy phenomena where quantitative aggregation may obscure critical nuances [30].

The methodology involves purposeful sampling of literature published between 2020 and 2025, selected based on relevance to palm oil's environmental performance, international trade policy, and farmer welfare impacts. This timeframe ensures contemporary policy relevance while capturing the evolution of research following the implementation of EU RED II and WTO dispute proceedings. Sources include peer-reviewed journal articles, official WTO documents, and authoritative institutional reports.

Thematic analysis guides the review process, with initial coding identifying emergent themes related to palm oil productivity, environmental performance, policy discrimination, and welfare impacts. Cross-validation across multiple sources strengthens findings, while explicit attention to contradictory evidence and research gaps ensures analytical rigor [6].

Literature Search Strategy

The literature search employed multiple academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, using keyword combinations such as "palm oil productivity per hectare," "EU RED II discrimination," "vegetable oil life cycle assessment," "oil palm carbon sequestration," and "palm oil smallholder welfare." Boolean operators connected these terms to capture relevant intersections (e.g., "palm oil AND land use efficiency AND comparative analysis").

Thematic Analysis and Synthesis

The analytical phase utilized a rigorous thematic coding framework to identify recurring patterns across the selected literature. Initial open coding of 97 sources generated preliminary categories, which were subsequently refined into four dominant themes: (1) Biophysical Superiority and Efficiency, (2) Mechanisms of Policy Discrimination, (3) Political Economy of Protectionism, and (4) Socio-Economic Welfare Impacts.

To ensure analytical validity, the study employed data triangulation, cross-referencing findings from biophysical studies (e.g., yield data, LCA results) with policy documents (e.g., EU regulations, WTO panel reports) and socio-economic analyses (e.g., farmer welfare studies). This methodological approach allows for a holistic synthesis that connects technical environmental data with the political and economic context of international trade governance, revealing the structural contradictions inherent in current global vegetable oil policies.

Research Findings: Thematic Analysis

The thematic analysis reveals a stark divergence between the scientific reality of palm oil's environmental performance and its treatment in international regulatory frameworks. The findings are organized into four primary themes that cumulatively substantiate the argument of international hypocrisy.

Theme 1: The Biophysical Superiority of Palm Oil

The literature overwhelmingly establishes palm oil as the biologically superior candidate for meeting global vegetable oil demand, primarily due to its unparalleled photosynthetic efficiency and land-sparing characteristics [31,32].

Unmatched Productivity and Land Sparing

The productivity gap between oil palm and its competitors is not merely incremental but exponential. Recent comparative studies confirm that while oil palm occupies only 6-7% of global oilseed land, it contributes approximately 36-40% of global output. Conversely, soybeans occupy nearly 40% of the land but contribute less than 20% of oil production. This efficiency creates a massive "land-sparing" effect: replacing the current global palm oil supply (approx. 75-80 million tons) with soybean oil would require an additional land area roughly the size of Brazil's Amazon forest [33].

Furthermore, genetic improvements and agronomic best practices are driving palm oil yields even higher. While current averages range from 3.3 to 4.0 tons/ha, elite planting materials in commercial estates routinely achieve 6-8 tons/ha, with theoretical potentials of 10-11 tons/ha. In contrast, yield improvements for annual oilseeds such as rapeseed and soybean have plateaued or show only marginal yearly gains. This diverging productivity trajectory suggests that palm oil's role in minimizing agricultural footprint will become even more critical in the coming decades [34,35].

Carbon Sequestration and Net Sink Capacity

A critical finding often absent from Western policy discourse is the carbon sequestration capacity of oil palm plantations. Unlike annual crops (soybean, sunflower) that leave land bare for significant portions of the year and require yearly soil tillage to release stored carbon, oil palm is a perennial tree crop that maintains continuous canopy cover for 25-30 years [36].

Empirical measurements indicate that a mature oil palm plantation sequesters approximately 64.5 tons of CO2 per hectare annually in its biomass (trunk, fronds, roots) and soil organic carbon. While this is lower than primary rainforests, it is significantly higher than the carbon stock of the degraded grasslands or scrublands often used for plantation expansion, and vastly superior to the carbon dynamics of annual monocultures. When managed with "zero-burning" replanting techniques and methane capture at mills, the net carbon footprint of palm oil production can be neutral or even negative, a feat currently unattainable for mechanized soybean or rapeseed production [37-40].

Input Efficiency and Circular Economy

Palm oil's superiority extends to input efficiency. It requires significantly less fertilizer, pesticides, and energy per ton of oil produced than rapeseed and soybeans. The production process generates massive quantities of biomass waste—Empty Fruit Bunches (EFB), Palm Kernel Shells (PKS), and Palm Oil Mill Effluent (POME)—which are increasingly used for renewable energy generation and bio-fertilizer [41,42].

Recent Life Cycle Assessments (LCAs) show that when biogas capture is used to treat POME, the Global Warming Potential (GWP) of palm oil drops by 30-60%, making it the lowest-emitting vegetable oil commercially available. This "circular economy" capability is intrinsic to the palm oil milling process but largely absent in the seed crushing industries of competitor oils [43-46].

Theme 2: Mechanisms of International Policy Discrimination

The second theme identifies the specific regulatory instruments used to marginalize palm oil, with the European Union's Renewable Energy Directive II (RED II) emerging as the primary case study of discriminatory policy design [47-49].

The "High ILUC-Risk" Classification

The central mechanism of discrimination in RED II is the concept of Indirect Land Use Change (ILUC). The directive classifies biofuel feedstocks into "low ILUC-risk" and "high ILUC-risk" categories. Remarkably, palm oil is the only primary feedstock categorized as high risk, leading to a mandated phase-out by 2030 and an immediate cap at 2019 consumption levels [50-52]. Scholars argue this classification is methodologically flawed and politically motivated. The ILUC formula relies on historical deforestation data (2008-2016) that penalizes palm oil for past expansion, while ignoring recent successes in reducing deforestation. Crucially, it exempts crops like soybean (despite the massive conversion of the Cerrado) and European rapeseed by setting arbitrary thresholds that conveniently protect EU domestic crops [51].

WTO Dispute Findings (DS593 & DS600)
The WTO panels in the disputes DS593 (Indonesia vs. EU) and DS600 (Malaysia vs. EU) delivered a nuanced but damning verdict on these measures. The panel report, circulated in March 2024, found that while the EU has the right to regulate for environmental objectives, the specific design and implementation of RED II violated non-discrimination obligations under the GATT and TBT Agreements [53-55].

Specifically, the panel noted that the "10% threshold" used to define high ILUC risk was arbitrary and not based on sufficient scientific evidence to justify the differential treatment between palm oil and rapeseed. The ruling essentially confirmed that the policy was designed to "target" palm oil specifically, rather than applying a neutral standard to all vegetable oils based on actual carbon performance [56-59].

Market Access and Non-Tariff Barriers
Beyond tariffs, palm oil faces a proliferation of non-tariff barriers (NTBs), including "Palm Oil Free" labeling campaigns and stringent Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) for substances like 3-MCPD, which are often set at levels far stricter than those applied to other refined oils. These technical barriers effectively restrict market access for developing country producers while insulating developed country markets. The rhetoric of "deforestation-free supply chains" (EUDR) further imposes compliance costs that are prohibitive for smallholders, effectively acting as a market-entry barrier [60-64].

Theme 3: The Political Economy of Hidden Protectionism
This theme explores the "why" behind discrimination, revealing that environmental rhetoric often serves as a convenient veil to protect uncompetitive agricultural sectors in the Global North [65,66].

Protecting the Rapeseed and Sunflower Lobby
The European agricultural sector heavily relies on rapeseed and sunflower production, which are significantly less efficient than palm oil. Without protectionist barriers, these crops cannot compete with imported palm oil on price or volume. Analysis of EU agricultural subsidies (CAP) reveals massive financial support for domestic oilseed growers, yet even with subsidies, they remain vulnerable to palm oil imports [67-69].

By framing palm oil as an "environmental pariah," EU policymakers successfully garnered public support for trade barriers that would otherwise be rejected as protectionist. This strategy, termed "green protectionism," allows the EU to claim moral leadership on climate change while simultaneously securing the economic interests of its farming constituents [70].

Green Colonialism and Regulatory Imperialism
The imposition of unilateral standards by the EU is widely interpreted in the literature as a form of "regulatory imperialism" or "green colonialism". These policies dictate land-use management to sovereign nations in the tropics without bearing the economic costs of conservation [71,72].

The narrative ignores the "Right to Development" of producer nations. While European nations cleared their forests centuries ago for agriculture, they now penalize Indonesia and Malaysia for utilizing their land resources for economic development. However, both nations maintain forest cover significantly higher than most European states (e.g., Indonesia >50% vs. UK <13%) [73-75].

Theme 4: Socio-Economic Impacts and Farmer Welfare
The final theme highlights the human cost of these policies, focusing on the 16 million smallholder farmers whose livelihoods are directly threatened by discriminatory trade restrictions [76,77].

Vulnerability of Smallholders
Smallholders manage approximately 41% of Indonesia's oil palm land. These are not corporate giants but family farmers for whom palm oil represents the only viable pathway out of poverty. Studies show a strong positive correlation between palm oil adoption and improved household welfare, nutrition, and educational attainment in rural Sumatra and Kalimantan [78].

Discriminatory policies that depress global CPO prices directly reduce the disposable income of these families. A decline in prices reduces the ability to purchase fertilizer, leading to lower yields and a vicious cycle of poverty [78,79].

The Burden of Certification
While certification schemes like RSPO (Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil) are intended to ensure sustainability, they often impose disproportionate costs on smallholders. The complexity of auditing, documentation, and compliance fees creates high barriers to entry [80,81].

Research indicates that "No Deforestation" commitments often result in the exclusion of independent smallholders from supply chains because companies view them as "high risk" and difficult to audit. Consequently, trade policies intended to "save the environment" end up marginalizing the poorest actors in the supply chain, pushing them toward informal markets with lower environmental standards [82,83].

Discussion and Analysis
The Efficiency Paradox: Penalizing the Solution
The core finding of this review is the "Efficiency Paradox." In a world facing dual crises of food security and climate change, logic dictates that agricultural systems should maximize output per unit of land (land sparing). Palm oil is the undisputed leader in this metric. Yet, global policy penalizes the most efficient crop while incentivizing less efficient alternatives.

If the EU's goal is truly to minimize global deforestation, shifting consumption from palm oil to soybean or rapeseed is counterproductive. As noted in the findings, replacing palm oil requires 6-9 times more land. Therefore, anti-palm oil policies, if successful in reducing palm oil market share, will paradoxically increase the total global agricultural footprint, driving deforestation in other biomes (e.g., the Brazilian Cerrado or European grasslands). This suggests that current policies are not evidence-based but rather driven by political expediency and Eurocentric environmental aesthetics that value temperate landscapes over tropical ones [9].

Analyzing Hypocrisy: The "Green Veil."
The literature supports characterizing this situation as "International Hypocrisy." The EU applies a doublé standard:
Strict ILUC penalties for Palm Oil Based On Historical Data.
Zero ILUC penalties for European crops despite evidence that expanding rapeseed production displaces wheat or corn, pushing those crops into new frontiers[6].

This "Green Veil" allows developed nations to export their environmental footprint. By banning sustainable palm oil from Indonesia (which has successfully reduced deforestation to historic

lows), Europe feels "clean," while continuing to consume vast amounts of soy (embedded in meat imports) and rapeseed, which have higher aggregate land/carbon footprints. The refusal to acknowledge the carbon sequestration value of oil palm plantations further cements this hypocrisy; it is a deliberate scientific blindness adopted to maintain the narrative of "dirty palm oil" [84].

Toward Trade Justice

The discussion points toward a need for a paradigm shift. Sustainability must be measured by **output efficiency** (Impact per Unit of Product), not just origin. A ton of oil that requires 0.15 hectares (palm) should inherently be preferred over one requiring 1.5 hectares (soy), provided the cultivation does not encroach on high-conservation-value areas [85,86].

Furthermore, the concept of sustainability must include **Social Sustainability**. A policy that impoverishes millions of smallholders cannot be called "sustainable," regardless of its environmental intent. The exclusion of farmer welfare as the implications of the EU RED II policy represents a fundamental failure of the policy to align with the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), specifically SDG 1 (No Poverty) and SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities)[87-91].

Conclusion and Recommendations

Substantive Conclusions

This qualitative literature review leads to the robust conclusion that the prevailing international trade regime governing vegetable oils is characterized by a structural asymmetry between objective scientific evidence and political expediency, resulting in a systemic violation of non-discrimination principles. The synthesis of empirical data confirms that the stigmatization of palm oil in Western markets contradicts its biophysical reality as the world's most resource-efficient oilseed, which offers unparalleled land-sparing benefits and significant carbon sequestration capacity. The analysis demonstrates that regulatory frameworks such as the European Union's Renewable Energy Directive II (RED II) and the EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) function less as instruments of global environmental preservation and more as tools of "disguised protectionism," designed to shield less efficient temperate oilseed industries from competitive tropical imports under the guise of sustainability.

Furthermore, this study identifies these unilateral trade measures as a manifestation of "green neocolonialism," where developed nations leverage their market power to impose extraterritorial standards that disregard the sovereign development rights and distinct ecological contexts of producer nations in the Global South. By enforcing a singular, Eurocentric definition of sustainability that penalizes high-yield tropical agriculture while exempting domestic crops with larger environmental footprints, these policies perpetuate a global trade hierarchy that marginalizes developing economies. The refusal to acknowledge the "efficiency dividend" of palm oil—specifically its ability to meet global demand with the lowest possible land requirement—reveals a fundamental hypocrisy in global climate governance, where geopolitical interests override the scientific imperative to maximize agricultural resource efficiency. Consequently, the current trade architecture not only distorts global markets but also actively hinders the attainment of genuine global sustainability by disincentivizing the most productive agricultural systems.

Policy Recommendations

To dismantle this discriminatory regime and restore integrity to the global trading system, a fundamental restructuring of international agricultural diplomacy and regulation is required. First, the international community must enforce a strict **Objectivity Mandate in Multilateral Trade Rules**, specifically within the World Trade Organization's Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) agreement. Trade measures justified on environmental grounds must be compelled to utilize crop-neutral, holistic Life Cycle Assessments (LCA) that prioritize "land-use efficiency" and "productivity per hectare" as central sustainability metrics. This shift would strip legitimacy from discriminatory classifications like "high ILUC-risk" that target specific crops based on origin rather than performance, ensuring that trade policy rewards actual environmental efficiency rather than geopolitical preference.

Second, producer nations must orchestrate a strategic pivot toward **Counter-Hegemonic Diplomacy** to challenge the normative power of unilateral standards. Institutions such as the Council of Palm Oil Producing Countries (CPOPC) should lead a coalition of the Global South to formally contest the legality of "green neocolonial" regulations that violate the principle of Common But Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR). This diplomacy should not merely seek market access. Still, it should aggressively litigate against the extraterritorial overreach of regulations like the EUDR, framing them as violations of national sovereignty and international law. Finally, to prevent the fragmentation of global markets, there is an urgent need to establish a Transnational Sustainable Vegetable Oil Framework under the auspices of a neutral body such as the FAO or UNCTAD, rather than allowing regional blocs to dictate global standards. This framework must explicitly recognize "land sparing" as a critical environmental virtue, thereby institutionalizing the scientific reality that high-productivity crops, such as palm oil, are indispensable for balancing global food security with biosphere conservation.

References

1. BPDP (2025) Vegetable Oil Champion: The World's Most Productive and Land-Efficient Crop, BPDP: Berita https://palmoilina.asia/berita-sawit/most-productive-vegetable-oil/.
2. Woittiez LS, van Wijk MT, Slingerland M, van Noordwijk M, Giller KE (2017) Yield gaps in oil palm: A quantitative review of contributing factors,Eur J Agron 83: 57-77.
3. GAPKI (2025) Global Oil Palm Plantations Have Larger Acreage Than Other Vegetable Oil Plantations, Myths & Facts, Publication, Recent News. Accessed: Dec. 25.
4. Lamade E, Bouillet JP (2005) Carbon storage and global change: the role of oil palm, CIRAD Agritrop Doss 12: 154-161.
5. Siallagan EJ, Siregar YI, Nofrizal N, Ismail UP (2025) Engineering carbon dynamics and vegetation indices in oil palm plantations: An integrated assessment of carbon stocks, normalized difference vegetation index, and net ecosystem exchange in Riau Province J. Ecol. Eng 26: 342-349.
6. Sihotang ED (2022) Analysis of Discriminatory Measures from European Union Renewable Energy Directive II to Indonesia as a Palm Oil Producer Country. ILREV Indones. Law 12: 42-53.
7. ASEANCham-EU (2025) "WTO ruling agrees that EU's RED II unfairly discriminates against Malaysia's palm oil but the 7% limit on palm-based biofuel is allowed https://www.aseancham.eu/wto-ruling-agrees-that-eus-red-ii-unfairly-discriminates-against-malaysias-palm-oil-but-the-7-limit-on-palm-based-biofuel-is-allowed/.
8. Solidaridad (2023) "Implications of the EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) for oil palm smallholders" 1.
9. Chiriacò MV, Galli N, Latella M, Rulli MC (2025) Pressure on Global Forests: Implications of Rising Vegetable Oils

Consumption Under the <scp>EAT</scp> -Lancet Diet Glob. Chang. Biol 31.
10. H. Ritchie (2025) Palm Oil: Explore palm oil production across the world and its impacts on the environment Our World in Data.
11. PASPI Monitor (2021) Palm Oil is the Most 'Oily' Vegetable Oil in the World, Palm Oil J 2: 327-332.
12. Awang AH (2021)Peat Land Oil Palm Farmers' Direct and Indirect Benefits from Good Agriculture Practices, Sustainability 13: 7843
13. Nobbs J, The Environmental Impact of Vegetable Oils," Jeff Nobbs. Accessed: Dec. 25,.
14. 14 Murphy DJ (2025)Agronomy and Environmental Sustainability of the Four Major Global Vegetable Oil Crops: Oil Palm, Soybean, Rapeseed, and Sunflower," Agronomy 15: 1465.
15. Jong HN (2025) Palm oil deforestation makes comeback in Indonesia after decade-long slump, Mongabay Asia Indonesian Palm Oil https://news.mongabay.com/2024/02/palm-oil-deforestation-makes-comeback-in-indonesia-after-decade-long-slump/.
16. PASPI Monitor (2023) Advantages of Oil Palm Plantations as Carbon Sink and Emission-Efficient Oil Production J. Anal. Palm Oil Strateg. Issues 4: 1-8. https://palmoilina.asia/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/4.15.-ADVANTAGES-OF-OIL-PALM-PLANTATIONS-IN-CARBON-SINK-AND-EMISSION_.pdf.
17. Munoz I, Schmidt JH, Dalgaard R (2025) Comparative Life Cycle Assessment of Five Different Vegetable Oils, Aalborg 165.
18. Schmidt JH (2015) Life cycle assessment of five vegetable oils," J. Clean. Prod., vol. 87: 130-138.
19. Paminto AK, Karuniasa M, Frimawaty E (2024) Optimization of palm oil biodiesel production: Environmental impact analysis and POME waste utilization, Appl. Environ. Sci 2: 15-30,
20. Schmidt J, Serena L, Varandas M (2025) Life Cycle Assessment of Palm Oil at United Plantations Berhad 2025, Results for 2004-2024. Summary report," 2.0-LCA. Accessed: Dec. 25, https://2-0-lca.com/publications/show/life-cycle-assessment-of-palm-oil-at-united-plantations-berhad-2025-results-for-2004-20 24-summary-report/.
21. Suhartono MJ, Sri Budiastuti MT, Mujiyo M,Gunawan S (2025) Enhancing oil palm productivity and lowering emissions through the application of local organic waste J. Ecol. Eng 26: 80-90.
22. Jong HN (2025) Indonesia and Malaysia assail new EU ban on 'dirty commodities' trade, Mongabay Asia Global Palm Oil https://news.mongabay.com/2023/01/indonesia-and-malaysia-assail-new-eu-ban-on-dirty-commodities-trade/.
23. Tyson A, Meganingtyas E (2022) The status of palm oil under the European Union's renewable energy directive: sustainability or protectionism?," Bull. Indones. Econ. Stud 58: 31-54.
24. PwC (2025) Indonesia's palm oil banned from Europe, IPOA targets new export market," PwC Indonesia Plantation News https://www.pwc.com/id/en/pwc-publications/industries-publications/consumer-and-industrial-products-and-services/plantation-highlights/june-2023/indonesias-palm-oil-banned-from-europe-ipoa-targets-new-export-market.html.
25. Baldon C, Braoudakis N (2025) "EU-Malaysia Palm Oil Dispute: WTO Confirms Legitimacy of Environmental Regulation but Cautions on its Concrete Implementation," Baldon Avocats https://baldon-avocats.com/eu-malaysia-palm-oil-dispute-wto-confirms-legitimacy-of-environmental-regulation-but-cautions-on-its-concrete-implementation/.
26. OFI (2025)WTO panel upholds EU RED II measures on palm oil but rules some aspects inconsistent with its rules, OFI: Oil and Fats International 25.
27. Hamid-Walker F (2025) Indonesia palm oil win against EU: a triumph for the Global South and climate justice?, The University of Melbourne: Indonesia at Melbourne. https://indonesiaatmelbourne.unimelb.edu.au/indonesias-palm-oil-win-against-eu-a-triumph-for-the-global-south-and-climate-justice/.
28. Reuters (2025) Indonesia, Malaysia aim to fight 'discrimination' against palm oil," Reuters World Business https://www.reuters.com/world/asia-pacific/indonesia-president-calls-collaboration-with-malaysia-fight-discrimination-2023-06-08/.
29. Amandari LT, Dewi YK (2022) Is the Measure to Phase Out Crude Palm Oil in RED II discriminatory based on the World Trade Organization Law?, Yuridika 37: 211-254.
30. Nasirly R, Sukendi F, Lestari, Putra RM (2024) A Bibliometric Review of Studies On Palm Oil Industry Life Cycle Assessment Research," Proc. Int. Conf. Multidiscip. Res. Sustain. Innov 1: 309-321.
31. Kaniapan S, Hassan S, Ya H, Patma Nesan K, Azeem M (2021)The Utilisation of Palm Oil and Oil Palm Residues and the Related Challenges as a Sustainable Alternative in Biofuel, Bioenergy, and Transportation Sector: A Review," Sustainability 13: 3110.
32. Lai V, Yusoff NYM, Ahmed AN, Huang YF, Boo KBW et al. (2024) The benefits and perspectives of the palm oil industry in Malaysia," Environ. Dev. Sustain 27: 15235-15249.
33. Babu BK, Mathur RK, Anitha P, Ravichandran G, Bhagya HP (2021) Phenomics, genomics of oil palm (Elaeis guineensis Jacq.): way forward for making sustainable and high yielding quality oil palm," Physiol. Mol. Biol. Plants 27: 587-604.
34. Kusumawardhana R, Darmawan DH,Chen JK (2020) Indonesian Oil Palm Replanting Program Will Support Achieving Sustainable Development Goals," AJHSSR Am. J. Humanit. Soc. Sci. Res 4: 271-278.
35. Murphy DJ, Goggin K, Paterson RR M (2021) Oil palm in the 2020s and beyond: challenges and solutions," CABI Agric. Biosci 2: 1-22.
36. Xu Y (2022) Recent expansion of oil palm plantations into carbon-rich forests," Nat. Sustain 5: 574-577.
37. GAPKI (2025) Oil Palm Can Function as Carbon Sink: Real or Unreal Fact? GAPKI Publication Recent New https://gapki.id/en/news/2025/12/07/oil-palm-can-function-as-carbon-sink-real-or-unreal-fact/.
38. Lai JY, Ngu LH, Hashim SS, Chew JJ, Sunarso J (2021) Review of oil palm-derived activated carbon for CO2 capture Carbon Lett 31: 201-252.
39. Rahman N, Giller KE, de Neergaard A, Magid J, van de Ven G, et al. (2021)The effects of management practices on soil organic carbon stocks of oil palm plantations in Sumatra, Indonesia J. Environ. Manage 278: 111446.
40. Murphy DJ (2024)Carbon Sequestration by Tropical Trees and Crops: A Case Study of Oil Palm Agriculture 14: 1133.
41. Abubakar MK, Kasim A, Ishak S, Uddin (2023) Maximizing oil palm yield: Innovative replanting strategies for sustainable productivity J. Environ. Earth Sci 5: 1-12.
42. Dalheimer B, Kubitza C, Brümmer B (2022) Technical efficiency and farmland expansion: Evidence from oil palm smallholders in Indonesia," Am. J. Agric. Econ 104: 1364-1387.
43. Rinaldo R, Suprihatin S, Yani M (2023) Life cycle assessment produksi crude palm oil (CPO) (studi kasus: PT X Provinsi

Bengkulu) Agrointek J. Teknol. Ind. Pertan 17: 651-659.
44. Siagian UWR, Wenten IG, Khoiruddin K (2024) Circular Economy Approaches in the Palm Oil Industry: Enhancing Profitability through Waste Reduction and Product Diversification," J. Eng. Technol. Sci 56: 25-49.
45. Alhaji AM, Almeida ES, Carneiro CR, da Silva CAS, Monteiro S, dos JS, Coimbra R (2024)Palm Oil (Elaeis guineensis): A Journey through Sustainability, Processing, and Utilization Foods 13: 2814.
46. Supriatna J, Saluy AB, Kurniawan D, Djumarno D (2025) Promoting sustainable performance of smallholder oil palm farmers: an analysis of key determinants and strategic priorities Int. J. Product. Perform. Manag 74: 1644-1675.
47. Salsabilla A, Ningrum IK, Rahayu DS (2023) The European Union's Interest in Implementing The Renewable Energy Directive II (RED II) Policy on The Issue of Discrimination Against Indonesian Palm Oil Dauliyah J. Islam Int. Aff 8: 186-195.
48. Suling CF,Purnomo EP, Hubacek K, Anand P (2023) The Influence of 'Renewable Energy Directive II' Policy for The Sustainability of Palm Oil Industry in Indonesia," J. Gov 8.
49. Judijanto L (2025) Bridging the Gap - The Role of Palm Oil in Shaping Global Trade and International Relations: A Review J. Polit. Sci. Int. Relations 1-13.
50. Sumfleth B, Majer S, Thrän D (2023) A Review of Trade-Offs in Low ILUC-Risk Certification for Biofuels Towards an Integrated Assessment Framework Sustainability 15: 16303.
51. Lieke SD, Spiller A, Busch G (2023) Can consumers understand that there is more to palm oil than deforestation?," Sustain. Prod. Consum 39: 495-505.
52. C. Sandford, C. Malins, G. Vourliotakis, and C. Panoutsou, "'Low ILUC-Risk' as a Sustainability Standard for Biofuels in the EU," Energies, vol. 17, no. 10, p. 2365, May 2024, doi: 10.3390/en17102365.
53. European Commission (2025) WTO rules on renewable energy dispute," European Commission: Policy Trade Europa https://policy.trade.ec.europa.eu/news/wto-rules-renewable-energy-dispute-2024-03-05_en.
54. J. Norris (2024) Trade and Environment Back in the Spotlight: Measuring-up the EU's Rules on Biofuels WTO Panel Report in EU–Palm Oil (DS600) Leg. Issues Econ. Integr 51.
55. Radmann BM (2021)Sustainability or protectionism in palm oil trade: the case (DS593) of Indonesia vs. the EU ARBE Acad. Rev. Bus. Econ 1-16.
56. I. Dreyer (2025) Malaysia palm oil WTO panel divided over EU protectionist intent Borderlex: European Trade Policy.
57. Bin Haron MH (2024) Malaysia's Palm Oil Question: Navigating the WTO's Decision on Malaysia's Dispute Against the EU's Sustainability Regulations," J. Asia Eur. Relations 3: 37-48.
58. Novaes RML, Moreira MMR, Arantes SM, Bachion LC, Hernandes TAD (2026) Dealing with the ILUC risk of biofuel production for the energy transition Energy Policy 210: 115035.
59. Puah CW, Lukman RA (2025) Policies in the European Union: Implications for Export of Palm Oil," in The Palm Oil Export Market, 1st ed., Routledge Taylor & Fracis Group 13.
60. Muhammad, Dampak Diskriminasi Kebijakan Perdagangan SawitUni Eropa Terhadap Perekonomian Indonesia (2023) Paradig. POLISTAAT J. Ilmu Sos. dan Ilmu Poli 6: 12-23.
61. Hamidi HNA, Khalid N, Karim ZA (2024)Palm oil trade restrictiveness index and its impact on world palm oil exports Agric. Econ. (Zemědělská Ekon 70: 101-111.
62. Bangun SZB, Ridho MR (2025) Analysis of European Union Non-Tariff Trade Barriers on Crude Palm Oil Imports from Indonesia," Strat. Soc. Humanit. Stud., vol. 3: 100-115.
63. Peci J (2023) Assessing the impact of non-tariff measures on international palm oil trade and their linkages with sustainable development goals, University of Reading doi: https://doi.org/10.48683/1926.00122705.
64. Ramadhani CP, Ervani E Pengaruh Kebijakan Tarif dan (2025) Non-Tarif terhadap Ekspor Minyak Kelapa Sawit Indonesia,J. Ekon. Bisnis, Manaj. dan Akunt 5: 358-369.
65. Rotberg RI, Hampson FO (2025) Grand Corruption: Curbing Kleptocracy Globally, 1st ed. New York: Routledge Taylor & Fracis https://lccn.loc.gov/2024015186.
66. Ajayi D (2021) Palm oil, eco-labels, and greenwash in a liberal environmental regime. University of British Columbia doi: 10.14288/1.0401117.
67. Thom F, Gocht A, Grethe H (2024) EU agriculture under an import stop for food and feed. World Econ 47: 2094-2121.
68. Sucker F (2021) Reflections on agricultural subsidies. SSRN Electron doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3925066.
69. de Paula Leite AC (2025) Commodity price dynamics and market interdependence in second-generation biofuels: implications for sustainability," J. Clean. Prod 514: 145777.
70. Umarach MS (2021)The Phenomenon of Green Trade Protectionism: Analysis of the EU Palm Oil Import Ban in the ASEAN Region," J. Ekon. dan Bisnis Airlangga 31: 103.
71. Waters K, Altiparmak SO, Shutters ST, Thies C (2024) The Green Mirage: The EU's Complex Relationship with Palm Oil Biodiesel in the Context of Environmental Narratives and Global Trade Dynamics Energies 17: 343.
72. Huong NTL, Hy NHT, Giang (2025) TTTEU Green Deal: Green Regionalism or Trade Protectionism?," in Chinese (Taiwan) Yearbook of International Law and Affairs 42: 150-171.
73. Geo Political Monitor (2025) Indonesia's Fight against the EU Palm Oil Ban, Astra Agro Lestari News https://www.astra-agro.co.id/2021/02/15/indonesias-fight-against-the-eu-palm-oil-ban/.
74. Pichler M, Bhan M, Gingrich S(2021) The social and ecological costs of reforestation. Territorialization and industrialization of land use accompany forest transitions in Southeast Asia. Land use policy 101: 105180.
75. Wartini S (2021) Balancing the Principle of Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources and Sustainable Forest Management: Indonesian Experiences. JE Asia Int'l L 14: 381.
76. Hasan MF, Fadhil I, Fahmid MM, Ahmad T (2022) Impact of the European Union Regulations on Indonesian Oil Palm Smallholder Farmers, Int. J. Oil Palm 5: 1-15.
77. Judijanto L(2025) Beyond deforestation debates: a review of social issue blindspots in EU palm oil trade policies, Rev. Caribeña Ciencias Soc 14: 4750, Aug.
78. Judijanto L (2025) Who Pays for Climate Action? The Disproportionate Impact of Deforestation-Free Regulations on Smallholder Farmers, Eur. J. Manag. Econ. Bus 3: 3-13.
79. Siregar AA, Halimatussadiah A, Moeis FR, Anky WAK, Nainggolan D (2024) The oil palm replanting imperative: Are smallholder farmers willing to participate?, For. Policy Econ 169: 103362.
80. Zachlod N, Hudecheck M, Sirén C, George G (2025) Sustainable palm oil certification inadvertently affects production efficiency in Malaysia," Commun. Earth Environ 6: 200.
81. Richartz C, Abdulai A (2025) Impact of organic and RSPO certifications on smallholder palm oil farmers' welfare and the environment in Ghana J. Clean. Prod 529: 146726.
82. Solidaridad (2024)Palm Oil Barometer 2024: Consultation 1

https://zerodeforestationhub.eu/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/Palm-Oil-Barometer-2024_Consultation_Paper-1.pdf.
83. Hanafiah M (2022) Impact of Malaysian palm oil on sustainable development goals: co-benefits and trade-offs across mitigation strategies, Sustain. Sci 17: 1639-1661.
84. Elbersen HW,Slingerland MM (2022) Palm oil could be much more sustainable, Wageningen University and Research 25.
85. Halpern BS (2022) The environmental footprint of global food production. Nat. Sustain 5: 1027-1039.
86. Vegter D, van Hillegersberg J, Olthaar M (2023) Performance measurement system for circular supply chain management. Sustain. Prod. Consum 36: 171-183.
87. Giralt L (2024) A Comprehensive Analysis of the European Union's Integration of the Right to Development and the Sustainable Development Goals: EU Development: From Policy to Practice," Uppsala University https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1879888&dswid=-8452.
88. Latka C (2022) Agri-food policies and Sustainable Development Goals: Quantitative food system analyses, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität https://bonndoc.ulb.uni-bonn.de/xmlui/handle/20.500.11811/10175.
89. Sukiyono K (2024) Smallholder palm oil and sustainable development goals (SDGs) achievement: An empirical analysis, Sustain. Futur 8: 1115.
90. Yosua R, Susilo A, Wisnujati NS (2024) Enhancing Productivity and Welfare: the Impact of Farmer-Cooperative Partnerships in the Oil Palm Sector, Aurora J. Emerg. Bus. Paradig 1: 39-48.
91. Raharja S (2020) Institutional strengthening model of oil palm independent smallholder in Riau and Jambi Provinces, Indonesia Heliyon 6.

Copyright: ©2026 Loso Judijanto. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.