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Summary

- Meat plays an important role in traditional French cuisine, but it is becoming an increasingly controversial topic.
- Red meats all have a relatively high iron content, which is particularly well absorbed by the body in the form of haem iron. But eating too much red meat has been proven to cause cancer. This has led health authorities to encourage eating red meats in moderation, while research is being conducted to limit the negative effects associated with producing, preparing and eating red meat.
- Cattle farming has a significant impact on the environment, and this fact has led to new developments in terms of livestock feed and new agricultural-ecological practices.

Antoine Herth, MP, Member of the Office

“Red meat”, a cultural concept

There is no strict definition of red meat. It does not correspond to a chemical definition, nor to a single production method. The reference to a certain colour does not necessarily correspond to what is immediately observed. As cultural historians have shown, the actual colour is not necessarily that which is described and perceived. But this trend has led, among other things, to veal calves being deprived of solid iron-rich foods, such as grass, in order to meet French expectations in terms of colour. For the purpose of this briefing, the term “red meat” means “non-poultry meat”, including pork.

Red meat is traditionally regarded as a highly beneficial, nutrient-rich and even essential part of our diet. As the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) points out, its consumption is linked to standard of living and higher incomes. However, in the more economically advanced countries, this relationship is gradually shifting in the opposite direction within the population.

In France, 32% of the population consumes at least 500 grams of red meat per week, this proportion being higher among men (41%) than among women (24.1%). This has an impact on both human health and the environment, due to its carbon footprint. Can we have high quality, nutritious food with a low carbon impact? What are the solutions for improving red meat’s carbon footprint, its human health benefits, or both? Can these solutions be developed through partnerships between scientific research institutions and livestock farms? Are they already?

Red meat and human health - benefits and dangers

- Chemical properties

Red meat contains a high level of haem iron. This type of iron is found in haemoglobin and myoglobin. However, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) concluded from a review of published studies on the subject that “the haem iron content of meat varies considerably” from one meat to another. EFSA has established that the percentage of haem iron is 69% of the total iron content in beef and 39% in pork. So, “after black pudding, beef has the highest total iron and haem iron content, and is significantly higher than mutton, pork and poultry.”

Cooking can reduce the amount of haem iron. For example, more is lost when lamb is boiled than when it is roasted. Therefore, the way in which the food is prepared needs to be taken into account when measuring its effect on human health.

- Haem iron - better absorption

Since iron deficiency can lead to anaemia, red meat has a comparative advantage over other foods in dietary terms, as haem iron is more easily absorbed by the body. Haem iron, which is found in meat and fish, is better absorbed by the body than non-haem iron, which is found in vegetables and dairy products. “70% of the iron consumed in the French diet is non-haem iron, but it represents only 20% of the iron found in the body; on the other hand, haem iron represents only 30% of the iron ingested, but 80% of the iron in the body is derived from it.” Other factors come into play, however, such as diet or the characteristics of the individual concerned.

In France, according to available epidemiological studies, the risks of advanced forms of iron deficiency corresponding to iron deficiency anaemia are quite low among the general population, however, since they affect only 3% to 4% of women of child-bearing age.
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• Cancer risk

While eating red meat has its benefits, it also has its risks. “Experimental studies have identified haem iron as a major factor in meat-induced colonic carcinogenesis".\(^{15}\) During digestion, haem iron produces an enzymatic reaction that catalyses the oxidation of lipids to form alkenals. These alkenals are both cytotoxic and genotoxic, i.e. they lyse colonic cells and cause breaks in their DNA.

The National Nutrition and Health Programme (PNNS – Programme national nutrition santé) therefore recommends that people should not eat more than 500 grams of red meat per week.\(^{16}\) For deli meats, or charcuterie, the maximum limit is set at 150 grams per week (PNNS 2019-2023). In 2018, the International Agency for Research on Cancer classified deli meats as a known human carcinogen. This was based on the findings of a working group of 22 international experts.\(^{17}\)

In 2015, more than 4,000 cancers were attributable to the consumption of processed meat in France. More than 4/5 of these were colorectal cancers. During the same period, there were approximately 2,000 cancers attributable to red meat consumption, with roughly the same proportion of colorectal cancers. The WHO has also classified red meat as carcinogenic. Based on meta-analyses, it estimates that eating 100g of red meat per day increases the risk of death from this type of cancer by an average of 17%. This increase is 18% if 50 g of deli meats are consumed each day.

• Cardiovascular risks

Two meta-analyses have shown that eating more meat and processed meat is associated with a significant increase in the risk of cardiovascular disease, particularly stroke: eating 50g of processed meat increases the risk of stroke by 42%\(^{18}\) and eating 100g of meat, half of which is processed, increases the same risk by 10%.\(^{19}\)

For both colorectal cancer and cardiovascular disease, reducing red meat consumption has been shown to reduce the associated risks. This health recommendation is particularly relevant for people who eat a lot of red meat (eight times per week).\(^{20}\)

• Can we expect to see new recommendations?

Initial experimental studies suggest that this effect may be reduced by consuming certain antioxidants, such as polyphenols.\(^{21}\) For example, an epidemiological study found a reduced risk of colorectal adenomas in women who eat a lot of antioxidants. Including vegetables in the same food bowl may reduce the carcinogenic risk associated with meat consumption.

The results do not provide a sufficient level of evidence to establish a prevention policy for the general population, or at least not yet, but current research is promising.

• Objective risk reduction strategies

The consensus of the consulted practitioners is that nutrition recommendations only affect those who are already aware of them and therefore less concerned by them. In this respect, the trials carried out to improve the supply of meat itself, in terms of its benefits for human health, are particularly significant.\(^{22}\)

Some meat preparation methods prevent lipid peroxidation during ingestion. Marinating beef with extracts of grape-olive antioxidants is one of these prevention methods.\(^{23}\) Turmeric is also a good choice of seasoning, but it makes the meat less attractive to consumers as it affects its “red” colour.\(^{24}\)

Further up the food chain, at the production stage, “recognising the role of peroxidation and nitrosylation opens up the possibility of reducing nutritional risks by adding antioxidants (...) to meat products during production or by incorporating them into livestock feed”.\(^{25}\) The use of antioxidants in cattle feed may even have a twofold benefit, for human health and for the environment, as it reduces the methanogenic activity of cattle.

Red meat and the environment

Red meat consumption has environmental implications, particularly for animal welfare, direct pollution and carbon footprint. The first two points depend largely on the farming method and are beyond the scope of this briefing, even though they are the subject of serious debate in society.

The focus here will be on ruminant livestock, mainly cattle, and the significant contribution it makes to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. We can therefore assume that cutting meat out of our diet is better for the climate. A recent study has established a Kaya equation in which the number of livestock appears to be the main multiplier of GHG emissions from livestock farming in France. But the authors themselves believe that “the potential to reduce GHG emissions is difficult to understand unless we adopt a systemic approach that takes into account other external environmental factors such as biodiversity, soil conservation, carbon stocks and animal welfare”.\(^{26}\)

In fact, some agricultural areas cannot be used for anything other than livestock farming, unless they are converted to other uses such as forestry.

A more detailed approach shows a marked variation in emissions according to the type of farming. For every 100g of protein produced in the form of beef, the average carbon footprint is 25 kilograms in carbon dioxide equivalents, but the values show a wide statistical spread.\(^{27}\) from 9kg for the first decile to 105kg for the last. This has prompted a great deal of research into how to make production techniques more carbon efficient.

• Measuring environmental impact

The environmental balance of beef and veal varies according to the calculation methods used.

The FAO uses the “life cycle assessment” to attribute 14.5%
Nevertheless, the main source of methane (CH$_4$) from rice fields. Between 1990 and 2017, these emissions waste, with the remainder corresponding to emissions water thanks to the filtering power of the grasslands.33 Grass-fed livestock contributes to producing high-quality management systems. In terms of CO$_2$ equivalent, the opposite effect, such as the increase in manure decreased slightly, mainly owing to a decrease in the number of dairy cows. But other factors have had the significant differences in estimates have been reported.29 In any case, direct emissions from individual farms are not solely attributable to animals. Of course, the main gases emitted are methane (CH$_4$) generated by enteric fermentation and livestock manure, and nitrous oxide (N$_2$O), essentially linked to the agro-system nitrogen cycle (nitrogen emissions from fertilisers and manure, and ammonia emissions from livestock farming - mainly cattle). Carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) is produced by burning fossil fuels (mainly tractor fuel) and soil treatments such as lime.30 Nevertheless, the main source of methane (CH$_4$) emissions in mainland France is livestock farming. This is due to enteric fermentation and the handling of animal waste, with the remainder corresponding to emissions from rice fields. Between 1990 and 2017, these emissions decreased slightly, mainly owing to a decrease in the number of dairy cows. But other factors have had the opposite effect, such as the increase in manure management systems. In terms of CO$_2$ equivalent, the livestock sub-sector represents 48% of emissions from the agricultural sector, mainly due to CH$_4$.31

- **Positive external environmental factors**

While the livestock sector’s negative environmental impact often far exceeds the impact of the livestock itself, agricultural experts are calling for its positive environmental factors to be taken into account as well.32 Grass-fed livestock contributes to producing high-quality water thanks to the filtering power of the grasslands.13 Secondly, ruminants can produce milk and meat from fodder that is not suitable for human consumption. Furthermore, grassland stores carbon. 34 Finally, sustainable grasslands are recognised as an important source of biodiversity in Europe.

- **A broader environmental impact**

To measure the environmental impact of livestock farming, there are five main factors to be considered: GHG emissions and changes in soil carbon stocks, water quality, air quality, the use of natural resources, and land use and the impact on biodiversity.35

- **Available action mechanisms**

In a report, INRAE proposed ten measures to reduce the environmental impact of livestock farming.36 including:

- **Direct improvements**

reduce the use of synthetic mineral fertilisers, by making better use of them and by increasing the value of organic resources, in order to reduce N$_2$O emissions; increase the share of legumes in field crops and temporary grasslands; develop No-Till Agriculture Practices to store carbon in the soil; reduce the amount of protein in animal feed to limit the nitrogen content of manure and reduce N$_2$O emissions; encourage agro-forestry and the planting of hedgerows to increase carbon storage in the soil and plant biomass; optimise grassland management to improve carbon storage; develop technologies, particularly mechanisation, and install gas flares to reduce CH$_4$ emissions associated with the storage of manure.

- **Indirect improvements**

Several indirect avenues for improvement are being explored. First of all, fatty waste from the food industry can be recycled or reused, thus reducing mass losses.37 In addition, there are a number of strategies for reducing air pollutants and GHG emissions generated by agriculture and farming.38 Ammonia (NH$_3$) mitigation measures can be applied to livestock buildings (air cleaning and removing animal waste), as well as to manure storage (covering storage pits and manure piles) and manure spreading (faster incorporation into the soil). Finally, methanisation, as a natural biological process, enables us to use organic matter, such as waste, livestock manure or crop surplus, to produce biogas. This biogas can be used to generate electricity and heat co-generation, or injected into the natural gas network (purified biogas). Using biogas as a renewable source of heat, electricity or fuel can replace the use of CO$_2$-emitting fossil fuels.39

- **The specifics of enteric fermentation**

Ruminants get their name from the enteric fermentation that takes place in their rumen. This fermentation leads to the formation of methane (CH$_4$), the extent of which depends on the species, their development, and the quality and quantity of the food they eat. In its 7th recommendation, INRAE proposes substituting carbohydrates for unsaturated fats in intensive livestock farming and using an additive (nitrate) in cattle feed in order to reduce enteric CH$_4$ production. According to some studies, adding legumes and chicory to cattle feed could reduce enteric methane emissions by up to 20%.40

- **Available action mechanisms**

In a report, INRAE proposed ten measures to reduce the environmental impact of livestock farming.36 including:
months, compared with 24 months elsewhere in Europe. By calving them earlier, we could reduce the average GHG emissions of a farm by about 3%. A better balance between dairy and beef cows, or suckler cows, which produce less meat for the same amount of grass (or feed) consumed, also helps to control environmental impact. However, neither the objective evaluation of the environmental impact of local livestock farms nor the search for practical improvements are sufficient to address the issue of the need for traceability of imported products, particularly with regard to deforestation and biodiversity losses.

- **Cattle: a link in the biodiversity chain?**

An INRAE study has highlighted that “dejecta [from domestic herbivores, sheep, cattle, horses] contribute to biodiversity in agricultural systems through their impact on environmental heterogeneity”. Their presence in the grassland ecosystem helps to maintain coprophagous beetles, commonly known as dung beetles.

Taking this approach to the extreme, the Dutch Taurus Foundation supports experiments in rewilding. This is based on re-introducing large herbivores, in the Côa Valley (Portugal) with wild horses, or in the southern Carpathians in the form of bison. In these radical experiments, humans take a back seat to nature, and the entire biodiversity chain is reconstituted without us.

**Nutritional choices and the environment**

The models developed for analysing the environmental impact of red meat are based on complex nutritional assumptions. People can choose from a range of balanced diets in which meat is more or less important, or sometimes not included at all. These diets are not built up by simple substitution – for example, replacing animal proteins with plant proteins – but require comprehensive regulation.

Recommendations for healthy and sustainable diets are very much dependent on culture, tradition and society. This briefing demonstrates that the health and environmental impact of red meat can be improved, particularly through moderating its consumption, without necessarily eliminating it.
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