

GLP podcast: Lab-grown meat bad for the planet? California's backwards pesticide rules; Presidential debates should focus on farm policy

Recent research shows that lab-grown meat may not live up to its environmental hype, requiring far more energy than its supporters claim. California is close to enacting excessive pesticide regulations that could needlessly harm its massive agriculture sector. What is the Golden State thinking? Everybody has to eat, yet presidential candidates spend very little time discussing their agriculture policies. This needs to change.

Podcast:

Join hosts Dr. Liza Dunn and GLP contributor Cameron English on episode 235 of Science Facts and Fallacies as they break down these latest news stories:

- [Is lab-grown meat environmentally harmful?](#)

Lab-grown, cell-based or cultured meat: whatever you call this alternative protein, it's been sold to the public as an earth-friendly alternative to meat derived from animals. According to recent research, however, that might not be true. Cell-cultured meat production generates around 25 times the emissions of beef, a study conducted by researchers at UC Davis concluded. The result has amplified an already intense debate between lab-grown meat advocates and their detractors in the agriculture industry. Which side really has the science on their side?

- [Viewpoint: 'California's plan to choose politics over science on pesticides will dump millions more tons of carbon and threaten food security'](#)

California may soon enact legislation that would allow its regulators to place additional regulations on pesticide use beyond what the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) deems necessary. The new proposal is ostensibly designed to protect public health and the environment, but its true affect could be to bury farmers and agricultural workers in paperwork and red tape that severely limit their production. A bill in Congress could halt California's plans, setting the stage for a debate over state's rights and regulatory science with profound implications for our food supply.

Follow the latest news and policy debates on sustainable agriculture, biomedicine, and other 'disruptive' innovations. Subscribe to our newsletter.

[SIGN UP](#)

- [America needs food: Why do presidential debates ignore agricultural policy?](#)

Presidential candidates spend most of their time talking about a handful of hot-button topics they know voters care about. Unfortunately, this strategy overlooks important issues that, while not as exciting to voters, have significant impacts on our quality of life. Agriculture is a prime example. Some candidates will

pay lip service to the importance of farmers or sustainable agriculture, though they rarely develop comprehensive policies that outline how they will ensure America remains a leader in farming innovation. How do we change that?

Dr. Liza Dunn is a medical toxicologist and the medical affairs lead at Bayer Crop Science. Follow her on X [@DrLizaMD](#)

Cameron J. English is the director of bio-sciences at the [American Council on Science and Health](#). Visit [his website](#) and follow him on X [@camjenglish](#)