SENTIENCE POLITICS

Cultured Meat: An Ethical Alternative To Industrial Animal Farming

Policy paper

Industrial livestock production presents a growing problem on a global scale in terms of animal welfare, environmental sustainability, and human health. One solution might be cultured meat, in which animal tissue is grown in a controlled environment using cell culture technology, thereby making the raising and killing of animals for food unnecessary. This approach shows great potential of meeting all the requirements of a humane, sustainable and healthy form of meat production. However, a great deal of scientific, technical, cultural and legislative challenges must be overcome before cultured meat can reach cost-competitiveness. Lack of funding is the main barrier to further development, and considerable upfront investment is needed for cultured meat to attain commercially viable retail prices. We therefore strongly support increased funding of cultured meat initiatives. This entails, in order of priority: research and development of technology suitable for mass production, promoting fact-based public discussion regarding the technology and its societal implications, and eventual marketing of end products to consumers.

June 2016

Policy paper by Sentience Politics.

Preferred Citation: Rorheim, A., Mannino, A., Baumann, T., and Caviola, L.(2016). Cultured Meat: An Ethical Alternative To Industrial Animal Farming. Policy paper by Sentience Politics (1): 1–14.

First release May 2016. Last update June 2016.

Website: sentience-politics.org

Contents

Adrian Rorheim, Research Associate, Sentience Politics
Adriano Mannino, President, Sentience Politics
Tobias Baumann, Director of Strategy, Sentience Politics
Lucius Caviola, Executive Director, Effective Altruism Foundation

Cultured Meat: An Ethical Alternative To Industrial Animal Farm

Introduction

Each year, more than 60 billion sentient animals[1] are reared in industrial conditions in order to produce meat. This global enterprise is currently the planet's main source of human pandemic diseases[2–5] and likely among its greatest concentrations of human-inflicted suffering.[6–8] Curbing this ongoing moral catastrophe should thus be of high concern for people aiming to effectively help as many sentient beings as possible.[6,9–12] Moreover, animal agriculture contributes to climate change and makes inefficient use of a significant portion of our available resources.[13]

Addressing this massive challenge would ideally involve a worldwide shift to a vegetarian lifestyle, but such a shift is unlikely to take place in our lifetimes. Humans around the world namely place a high value on meat in terms of taste, nutrition, and tradition, evidenced in part by a clear rise in global meat consumption over the past half century — a trend strongly associated with economic growth in newly industrializing countries.[14–16] Despite the vegetarian movement having witnessed steady growth in recent years, its growth pales in comparison to the global demand for meat, which is predicted to increase by 73% within 2050.[17] Meanwhile, plant-based meat substitutes have, despite decades of costly improvements, not proven sufficiently effective at replacing meat in people's diets.[18] It would thus be a significant gain if we were able to introduce a cruelty-free replacement for meat with the ability to rival conventional livestock-production.

Enter cultured meat, an innovative way of synthesizing meat from animal tissue samples. Compared with conventional methods of meat production — which involve the breeding, raising, feeding, and slaughter of living animals — cultured meat instead involves using a cell sample to grow desired tissue in a controlled environment, making use of biotechnology originally developed for medical research and organ transplants. Proponents of cultured meat argue that this technology holds considerable promise as a replacement for conventional meat. Indeed, cultured meat seems likely to offer vast benefits in terms of animal welfare,[19,20] environmental impact[21–23] and human health.

The concept of producing meat intended for human consumption independent of a complete living organism has been a subject of speculative interest since at least 1931,[24] but proof of concept has existed in various forms only since the early 2000's.[25] Cultured meat technology is still in its experimental stage and has so far been limited to producing a small number of processed meat items in laboratory settings for demonstrative purposes.[26,27] Current research is focused on refining production methods in order to lower cost, improve scalability and minimize dependence on animal sources.

In this paper, we begin by presenting the rationale behind developing animal-free meat products. Moving on, we explore cultured meat and its ethical, economic, environmental, and human health implications. We then review the most pressing challenges facing public acceptance and technical feasibility of cultured meat production, and conclude by proposing a number of funding recommendations.

Current impacts of livestock-based meat

Environmental

Greenhouse gas emissions: The main causes of climate change are usually attributed to transportation and housing. This, however, ignores another significant contributor: according to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), animal agriculture is responsible for 14.5% of the world's total GHG emissions.[28] It is therefore as bad for the environment as the combined impact of every motor vehicle in the world, which collectively represent at 15%.[29] Methane, whose global warming potential is 25 times greater than that of carbon dioxide,[30] makes up 44% of the animal industry's total emissions. Most of this methane is emitted by ruminants such as cows, sheep and goats as a natural by-product of their digestive processes. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) maintains that a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions of at

least 50% by 2050 is necessary in order to avoid the worst impacts of climate change.[31]

Resource inefficiency: The global surface area required for livestock farming – including land used for grazing and feed production – currently takes up around 70% of all arable land on the planet, and 30% of its total ice-free land surface.[2] The rate at which livestock animals convert feed to energy and protein, meanwhile, is extremely inefficient; cows, for example, normally convert less than 5% of their protein and energy intake into edible meat.[14] Taking into account the water consumption for production, more than 15,000L of water are needed for 1kg of beef.[32,33]

Water pollution: The livestock sector uses a great deal of water for feed production, animal rearing, and sanitation. Water recycled from livestock manure is currently responsible for around 33% of global nitrogen and phosphorous pollution, 50% of antibiotic pollution, and 37% of toxic heavy metals contaminating the world's freshwater. Additionally, around 37% of pesticides that end up in global freshwater supplies have their origin in the production of animal fodder.[2]

Human health

Infectious disease transmission: Livestock pose a significant disease risk to humans. Around 60% of all known human diseases and 75% of the most damaging emerging diseases are zoonotic (animal-transmitted) in origin.[2,3] Most pathogens of recent concern – such as bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) and all forms of influenza (swine, avian, etc.) – are transmitted through livestock in particular.[4,5] Increases in global demand for animal products have already led to intensification of industrial livestock farming,[2,34] and this trend is expected to magnify as millions of households are lifted out of poverty in developing countries.[16] This has greatly increased overall risk of zoonotic disease transmission between livestock and humans.[2,35]

Antibiotic resistance: In animal agriculture, antibiotics are widely used in sub-therapeutic doses in order to promote animal tissue growth, and as a low-cost preventative biosecurity measure intended to cope with the aforementioned disease transmission problem. However, this practice – which has resulted in substantial antibiotic contamination of waterways[36] – is now considered a leading cause of the global rise of antimicrobial-resistant (multiresistant) pathogen strains.[37–39] The World Health Organization considers this one of today's biggest threats to global health.[38,40,41]

Animal welfare

Non-human sentience: There is scientific consensus regarding animal sentience and their capacity to suffer[42] and this is officially recognized in EU legislation[43]. The opposing view that conscious experience is only possible in human brains is not supported by current evidence[44,45]. It follows that any needless suffering inflicted upon animals under human care, whether through direct action or inaction/neglect, is morally indefensible and must be stopped.

Suffering in factory farms: Intensive animal farming is inescapably associated with systematic disregard for their welfare.[46–48] Animal farming is already very inefficient in terms of land and sustenance resources,[49,50] and high market demand for meat thus results in farmers striving to make all aspects of production more cost-effective. Maintaining the well-being of animals is often time-consuming, yet not strictly necessary to produce meat at an affordable level. The result is that animal welfare measures are commonly reduced to an absolute minimum or largely ignored in factory farms.[7,46–48,51–54] An example of this effect is the "broiler chicken", a chicken breed optimized for morbid obesity and rapid maturation. Kept in intensive farming conditions throughout the industrialized world, these birds frequently experience lifelong suffering[46,55] from their legs collapsing under their own morbid weight[11,12] and from chronic sickness due to poorly ventilated, overcrowded and/or tightly confined living conditions.[55]

Poor legal protection: Despite U.N. and EU guidelines to ensure animal welfare,[43,56] actual legislation on a national level is often weak and/or poorly enforced.[46,55] Moreover, established laws are routinely disregarded by manufacturers;[57] in Europe alone, at least 80% of piglets are routinely subjected to painful mutilations like tail amputations and castration — both without anaesthesia.[51,58] This ignores EU directives requiring that member states "... shall, since animals are sentient beings, pay full regard to the welfare requirements of animals", in-

cluding their freedom from pain, injury, discomfort and distress.[43] It is not uncommon for large meat producers to resist public inspection of their farms and slaughterhouses, and part of what is currently known about animal abuse in the meat industry is thus a result of investigations by animal charities, both undercover[57,59] and in cooperation with farming contractors.[60]

Cultured meat in comparison

Environmental impact

Predictive environmental analyses: Assessing the resource efficiency of industrial processes that don't yet exist involves making many informed assumptions, many of which will later turn out incorrect. Life cycle analyses have so far predicted that cultured meat would require 99% lower land use and 82 – 96% lower water use than its animal agriculture equivalents.[21] Subsequent analyses have placed energy use predictions much higher due to the large amounts of electrical energy that would be needed to provide sufficient heat to the culturing process.[22] Overall, however, cultured meat is expected to be significantly more resource efficient than animal agriculture, especially when predictions of future meat consumption are taken into account.[23]

Environmental pollution: The aforementioned life cycle analyses predict that cultured meat would produce 78 – 96% less greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions than conventional meat.[21] Replacing all meat production with cultured meat could reduce EU emissions by two orders of magnitude.[61] Excluding animals from meat production would also eliminate the need for manure disposal and management, which currently involves the use of manure lagoons.[62] Cultured meat would replace these highly problematic sources of pollution with closely monitored and quality-controlled filtration systems.[27] Again, these are speculative figures and should be regarded as such.

Human health

Sterile production: Due to the aseptic and strictly controlled environment required for its production, producing meat from cell cultures is safer than conventional production through animal husbandry.[63] Conventional risks of zoonotic infection are bypassed when no live animals are directly involved in production.[64–66] The only current producer of cultured meat reports that antibiotics are not required during production.[27] In line with current medical standards, initial tissue samples from biopsies require screening for infectious agents before eventual use in cultured meat production. The end product is thus safer during storage, preparation and consumption than its conventional counterparts.

Composition of end product: Another benefit of strict manufacturing control is that it allows for significant modification of the final product during production (as opposed to relying mainly on post-production processing) at levels currently unattainable in conventional meat production.[67] A wide range of alterations to the final product's nutritional composition, taste, and texture is thus made available by e.g. co-culturing with other cell types or introducing additives during the culturing process.[68] Genetic modification[64] can be used for the same purpose, but runs the risk of rejection by consumers due to public concern over safety.

Commercial

Product safety: The fact that it is virtually impossible to grow cultured meat outside of a sterile environment could make it a preferred alternative for many consumers who are worried about food safety.[69] In particular, the roughly 65% of European consumers who are worried about biological risks (contamination from antibiotics and zoonoses) may prefer cultured meat over other options.[70] However, the same surveys also showed technological risks (chemical additives and cloning) as being of higher concern among consumers than biological risks. It is therefore uncertain whether promoting food safety will benefit cultured meat acceptance among consumers.

Innovative product attributes: Strict control over the manufacturing process would allow for products to be nutritionally fortified[64,67,68,71,72] and contain less unhealthy fat.[66] This may present an opportunity to meet consumer demand for healthier foods[70] and to help prevent malnourishment in poorer populations. Producers could also experiment with a range of characteristics that consumers would find interesting, such as novel flavors, colors and textures.[73] Culturing also allows for the production of exotic or

otherwise rare animal meats[65,71] which, in addition to being of potential commercial interest, may replace much of the legal[73] and illegal[74] markets for exotic animals.

Improved ethical profile: European consumers express an increasing concern over the impacts of meat production on food safety, the environment, and animal welfare.[69,70,75–80] There is some evidence of consumers being willing to pay extra for safety-labelled products due to this concern, particularly regarding products from well-known brands.[81] In recent years, animal welfare in particular is identified as a deciding factor for consumers in evaluating the ethical profile of brands, with cost being the main barrier to buying more products regarded as ethical in this regard.[82–84] Thus, already-established meat producers may find a chance to improve public perception of their brand, in terms of food safety and animal welfare, by adopting cultured meat technology.[85] Indeed, at least one leading international brand is already considering this opportunity.[86]

Market expansion potential: In the likely event that cultured meat turns out to be significantly more cost-effective to manufacturers when compared to normal production methods, we should also expect a proportional decrease in the market value of meat products, opening up for significantly lower retail prices on meat products.[62] This presents a potential win-win: more low-income consumers would be able to afford meat products with a higher nutritional and caloric density than many staple foods currently provide, and producers would in turn benefit from the increased revenue following expansion into this huge new target market.

Animal welfare

No need for slaughter: Perhaps cultured meat's greatest potential benefit over conventional production is the fact that it does not rely on slaughtering animals at any point in the manufacturing process. Each of the individual parent cells involved in cultured meat production can multiply a vast number of times, and each donor animal possesses billions of such cells in their body. The number of animals required for tissue samples are thus orders of magnitude less than for conventional meat production. Depending on the method and type of cell used, a single "parent cell" could theoretically supply the annual global demand for meat products before needing replacement.[87] However, natural variations in characteristics between cell samples (i.e. those extracted from living animals) renders them impractical for use in early phases of basic research. It is therefore more likely that genetically modified cell lines would be used during the initial research phase, as these cells are more homogeneous between batches. They would not, however, be necessary for use in actual food production. Even so, a genetically altered cell line could be made physically immortal, meaning that a single tissue sample from one livestock animal would theoretically be enough to meet endless future demand.

Minimal harm: Cells can be collected by drawing a small amount of stem cells from an animal using a biopsy needle, a type of syringe. This common medical procedure takes only a few minutes, can be performed under local or full anaesthesia, and poses little risk of long-term complications[88] — altogether causing negligible harm compared to what animals in the meat industry are normally forced to endure on a lifelong basis.

Concerns over culture medium: "Feeding" nutrients to cell cultures is achieved by means of a *culture medium*, a sterile liquid containing essential macro-nutrients (sugars, amino acids) and micro-nutrients (vitamins, minerals) for the growing cells. At the moment, foetal bovine serum (FBS) is a key component of the standard culture medium used in biotech labs all over the world. Obtaining this ingredient requires slaughtering a pregnant cow and draining blood from the heart of its live, un-anesthezised fetus – a decidedly inhumane process[89] which has so far posed a major problem for the ethical profile of cultured meat. Ideal culture media should be free of animal-sourced ingredients, and prototypes of FBS-free culture media based on plants, fungi and microalgae have already been demonstrated.[26,90–95] Microalgae production has also been accounted for in speculative life cycle analyses of large-scale cultured meat production systems.[22,61] While further refinement is needed for plant-based media to compete with the effectiveness of FBS, they nonetheless provide a promising proof-of-concept that ingredients sourced from slaughtered animals are not a requirement for cultured meat production. Moreover, the fact that FBS is used in practically all the

world's biotech labs in spite of its often heterogeneous composition between batches (which often leads to inconsistent data if more than one batch is used in a given study) means that there is already a strong incentive in the biotech industry to develop highly consistent culture media which can be mass-produced from raw materials.[92]

Challenges to cultured meat development

Current status

Funding for basic research: Much of the basic biotechnology research needed to mass produce cultured meat has yet to be done, including studies on optimal cell lines and culture media.[96] There are as yet no scientific disciplines, departments or institutes devoted entirely to the research and development of "biofabrication" or "cellular agriculture" as distinct areas of study.[97] Most research into cellular agriculture to date has thus been undertaken as isolated projects and have consequently not been met with widespread academic interest. This point is illustrated by the fact that all cultured animal products of recent fame (ground beef, leather, milk, etc.) have been manufactured in laboratory conditions, using costly techniques adapted ad-hoc from related fields in biotechnology that normally exist in relative isolation. Ongoing initiatives with promising long-term strategies are currently held back by a severe lack of funding.

Few researchers: Contrary to what is often portrayed in news media coverage, very little scientific attention is being given to the research and development of cellular agriculture – including cultured meat – as of March 2016. One expert estimate places the number of entirely devoted researchers at about 5 individuals worldwide, with another 50-100 known researchers in related fields expressing varying degrees of interest in working on cellular agriculture.[96]

Lack of regulatory preparedness: Although some european countries have mentioned cultured meat in the context of novel foods,[98–100] the relative infancy of the science behind it means that current food industry regulations are generally not prepared for commercial production at any significant scale.

Genetic modification: Genetic modification (GM) is not strictly necessary at any point in the production of cultured meat. It may, however, be needed during initial phases of research (see: *Concerns over culture medium*), as well as potentially ensuring economic viability at some point in the future, and should thus not be ruled out as a potential tool.[96] Any use of GM in the production of cultured meat should necessarily involve rigorous transparency and openness to public inquiry to alleviate any concerns related to the safety of GM foods.

Product mimicry: Two cultured meat products have been demonstrated so far, both made from beef cells: one hamburger[101] and one meatball.[102] Both were described as unambiguously meat-like in taste, yet lacking in certain qualities like moisture and fat. The teams behind each demonstration report that existing technology can be used to improve taste, texture and nutritional composition.[27,94] Difficulties in replicating complex textures such as steak, chicken breast, and bacon have so far limited textures to that of mince meat. Significant improvements are needed to overcome these difficulties, yet only one study is going on at the moment.[103] Improving ground beef products to the point of market-competitive texture is much less challenging and therefore remains the primary focus for now.[26,27] This approach seems most likely to secure cultured meat a place among popular meat products on store shelves, which will be crucial in gaining acceptance for all subsequent cultured products as soon as they are introduced.

Culture medium: Although prototypes of animal-free culture media exist and have been used to produce muscle tissue,[26,71,90,94,95] progress in this area is severely hindered by the fact that optimal cell lines have not yet been found, as individual cell lines often require distinct medium formulations to proliferate.[96,104] Biomass from microalgae seems the preferred source for the nutrients needed in culture media; however algae production at scales large enough to meet the requirements of cultured meat poses a number of technical challenges, many of which (including the scaling up of cost-efficient photobioreactors) are currently being tackled for applications in seemingly unrelated fields such as biofuels[105,106] and animal feed.[107]

Energy requirements: One recent life cycle analysis (LCA) of cultured meat production found that, while land

and water use are expected to be far lower than all other forms of meat production, its energy requirements would be extremely high compared with previous estimates.[22] However, the analysis extrapolated data based on assumptions of technology that does not yet exist and contradicts previous findings, making it far from conclusive.[108] Whether or not the energy requirements present a problem depends on the efficiency of renewable energy sources, which may improve in the future thanks to rapid developments in solar power and other renewables.[66,109,110]

Cost: The only private company making cultured beef as of June 2016 reports a production cost of about €36,200/kg,[27] representing an 18-fold price reduction compared with the €650,000/kg burger unveiled in 2013. One leading researcher announced in late 2015 that, under ideal conditions, combining pharmaceutical bioreactor technology to existing tissue culture techniques can already reduce costs to €60/kg of cultured ground beef.[26] It should be noted that, while the cost of cultured meat should aim to match that of regular meat, the current market average of meat[111] is artificially low as a result of heavy government subsidizing of animal agriculture.

Public perception

Media coverage: News media have generally presented cultured meat in a positive light, and have tended to highlight its environmental benefits.[112] The summer of 2013 witnessed two highly publicized, independent promotion events: first a TED talk on cultured meat and leather in June,[113] followed in August by the first public tasting of a cultured burger on British television.[101] Cultured meat has since been presented at the World Economic Forum in 2015,[26,94] and a cultured meat start-up was launched in early 2016 to widespread interest from news and social media alike.[102] However, news stories often portray incorrect stages of development, giving unrealistic impressions of the extent of progress within the field.[96]

Consumer attitudes: A small-scale survey of Dutch consumers found that, when asked if they were willing to try cultured meat once it becomes available, being given information about its environmental benefits caused positive responses to increase from 25% to 43%, a near-doubling compared with basic informing about the technology itself.[114] Recent online polls conducted on social and news media sites have shown that 7 out of every 10 respondents would like to try cultured meat once it becomes available.[115–117]

Common objections to cultured meat

"Cultured meat is unnatural, and therefore unhealthy/dangerous/undesirable."

This argument rests on the assumption that what is natural is good, and what is unnatural is bad (appeal to nature). However, examples such as natural disasters and surgery show that this equalisation is dubious: something can be natural and bad, or unnatural and good. Thus, calling cultured meat "unnatural" does not imply that it is undesirable. Also, it is unclear why cultured meat in particular is unnatural, but animal agriculture is not. There is currently very little resemblance between nature and industrial meat production in terms of how animals are bred, housed, fed, and slaughtered. Arguments of this kind are thus better understood as critiques against inherent qualities of industrialization itself, rather than any of its specific uses. Although cultured meat may be "artificially" produced, the end result is just as "real" as conventional meat, and thus poses no greater health risk — in fact, since it is manufactured in a controlled environment, cultured meat is far less likely to contain harmful by-products, unhealthy fats, and food-borne pathogens than its conventional counterpart.

"Cultured meat represents no ethical progress as long as foetal bovine serum is used."

Only cultured meat that is produced without the use of animal-derived culture media is wholly ethically unproblematic, not to mention economically viable. We consider the development of animal-free culture media a necessity for cultured meat development, and we therefore strongly support efforts to achieve this goal.

"Although cultured meat may be a short-term solution, it does not change underlying attitudes towards animals or the environment, and is therefore bad in the long term."

It is indeed important to address underlying speciesist attitudes, as this determines how nonhuman animals will be treated in the future. However, the development of cultured meat does in fact indirectly contribute to a long-term change in social norms and attitudes. The behavioural fact of meat eating is an obstacle to unbiased moral rea-

soning that cultured meat could greatly reduce. By eliminating the need to defend everyday behaviour, cultured meat makes it psychologically easier to care about nonhuman animals both on an individual and on a political level. Thus, cultured meat could facilitate the transition from today's heavily speciesist society to a more antispeciesist one in the future. In general, however, any ideal solution would need to combine attitude- and behavior-improving approaches with technological ones in order to ensure lasting change.

Conclusions

It appears that, by gradually replacing animal agriculture, large-scale production of cultured meat could greatly reduce animal suffering, human disease risk, and environmental problems. Achieving this will nevertheless be an extremely difficult, costly and time-consuming challenge, requiring several years' worth of concerted effort across multiple disciplines before cultured meat can rival conventional meat products. However, cultured meat research has received very little attention so far, making it relatively easy to conduct basic research that may later prove catalytic to further development. This, in combination with its potentially extraordinary return on animal and human welfare in the long term, convinces us that accelerating cultured meat is a worthwhile investment at this time.

We therefore strongly support efforts to:

1. **Fund and promote academic interest in cellular agriculture**

   Due to its high uncertainty, pioneering science should ideally take place within the low-risk research climate of academia, with funding provided by governments and non-profits to ensure that findings become publicly available. This will enable widespread adoption and refinement of techniques across scientific disciplines worldwide. It is our understanding that, at this time, the following research focus points are of particular importance: optimal cell lines, plant-based culture media, scaling-up of bioreactors, and perfusion systems for growing complex muscle tissue.

2. **Increase public awareness about the benefits of cultured meat**

   Once a solid research foundation exists, entrepreneurs will be able to experiment with scaling and marketing of cultured products to consumers. It is possible that the ensuing market could expand rapidly if significant public interest in cellular agriculture already exists by this time.

3. **Facilitate cultured meat development through policy changes**

   It is possible that government subsidies and increased national budgets for bio- and agrotechnology research can accelerate the development of cultured products. Once economically viable, cellular agriculture will also require new regulatory frameworks in each country where production is to take place. Early involvement from political organizations may ease the intricate political work that is needed in both cases.

Funding recommendations

New Harvest

This small, transparent[118] nonprofit works to establish cellular agriculture as a distinct field in biotechnology. They do this by funding and coordinating catalytic research, fostering communication across relevant fields in academia, business and politics, and running public awareness campaigns. Despite having a short track record due to their small size, they appear to be involved to varying degrees in all recent and ongoing cultured meat projects, and are currently scaling up in order to accommodate a growing workload. It is our understanding that New Harvest has a concrete and actionable mission and strategy, which includes short-term plans to help grantees with funding and scientific counseling, as well as long-term plans to establish academic, political and social support of cellular agriculture.[96]

Muufri, Clara Foods

Initiated by New Harvest, these two companies are using cellular agriculture to produce milk and eggs, respectively. Neither of these commodities require living cells or tissue

in the final product, making them far simpler to mass produce using current technology than any other cultured animal product. They thus present an opportunity for cultured foods to secure a place in consumer markets relatively soon, which is likely to aid consumer acceptance of cultured meat products once they are available for consumption.[18]

Algae biofuels

It is our understanding that cultured meat cannot be produced economically without ready access to large amounts of the raw biomass that is needed to grow muscle tissue. This biomass would necessarily have to be more resource-efficient than the crops currently used to produce animal feedstocks. Microalgae seems the preferred source for this biomass, and while microalgae are already produced industrially to some extent, the algaculture industry itself is still in its infancy and thus needs significant scaling up before it can meet the requirements of mass-produced cultured meat. Consequently, it seems that rapid establishment of a large algae biomass industry is needed to supply the eventual development of cultured meat on a large scale. The majority of ongoing innovation in this field is taking place in the biofuels industry, an emerging sector whose solutions for combating climate change and food shortage seem favorable in the long term.[66] We thus recommend funding towards the acceleration of algae biofuels as a potential win-win for speeding up the large-scale development of cultured meat.

References

[1] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. FAOSTAT agriculture – livestock primary dataset: world total of animals slaughtered for meat in 2012. http://faostat.fao.org/site/569/DesktopDefault.aspx?PageID=569, 2012. Accessed: 2016-1-26.

[2] Henning Steinfeld, Pierre Gerber, Tom Wassenaar, Vincent Castel, Mauricio Rosales, C de Haan, and Others. *Livestock's long shadow: environmental issues and options*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), 2006.

[3] Bryony A Jones, Delia Grace, Richard Kock, Silvia Alonso, Jonathan Rushton, Mohammed Y Said, Declan McKeever, Florence Mutua, Jarrah Young, John McDermott, and Dirk Udo Pfeiffer. Zoonosis emergence linked to agricultural intensification and environmental change. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 110(21):8399–8404, 21 May 2013.

[4] Jessica H Leibler, Joachim Otte, David Roland-Holst, Dirk U Pfeiffer, Ricardo Soares Magalhaes, Jonathan Rushton, Jay P Graham, and Ellen K Silbergeld. Industrial food animal production and global health risks: exploring the ecosystems and economics of avian influenza. *Ecohealth*, 6(1):58–70, March 2009.

[5] Zoonotic diseases. http://www.who.int/zoonoses/diseases/en/, 22 October 2015. Accessed: 2016-2-4.

[6] Yuval Noah Harari. Industrial farming is one of the worst crimes in history. *The Guardian*, 25 September 2015.

[7] Peter Singer. *Animal liberation*. Random House, 1975.

[8] Peter Singer. The abuse of animals won't stop until we stop eating meat | peter singer. *The Guardian*, 11 February 2015.

[9] Benjamin Todd. Which cause is most effective? - 80,000 hours. https://80000hours.org/2014/01/which-cause-is-most-effective-300/#ending-factory-farming, 21 January 2014. Accessed: 2016-1-26.

[10] Tom Ash. The new animal charity evaluators recommendations are out. http://effective-altruism.com/ea/bn/the_new_animal_charity_evaluators_recommendations/, 1 December 2014. Accessed: 2016-1-26.

[11] Open Philanthropy Project. Treatment of animals in industrial agriculture | GiveWell. http://www.givewell.org/labs/causes/treatment-animals-industrial-agriculture, September 2013. Accessed: 2016-1-26.

[12] Peter Singer. Factory farming: A moral issue. http://www.utilitarian.net/singer/by/20060322.htm, 22 March 2006. Accessed: 2016-1-26.

[13] Laura Wellesley, Catherine Happer, and Antony Froggatt. Changing climate, changing diets: Pathways to lower meat consumption. Technical report, Chatham House Report, November 2015.

[14] Vaclav Smil. Worldwide transformation of diets, burdens of meat production and opportunities for novel food proteins. *Enzyme Microb. Technol.*, 30(3):305–311, 13 March 2002.

[15] Timothy Robinson, Philip Thornton, Gianluca Franceschini, Russ Kruska, Federica Chiozza, An Notenbaert, Giuliano Cecchi, Mario Herrero, Michael Epprecht, S Fritz, and Others. Global livestock production systems. Technical report, 2011.

[16] Hannah Hoag. Humans are becoming more carnivorous. *Nature News*, 2 December 2013.

[17] FAO. World livestock 2011 - livestock in food security. Technical report, FAO Publications, Rome, 2011.

[18] Stefan Schubert. Prioritisation of policy interventions to support cultured animal products and plant-based substitutes of animal products. June 2016.

[19] Peter Singer. The world's first cruelty-free hamburger. *Guardian*, 5 August 2013.

[20] Patrick D Hopkins and Austin Dacey. Vegetarian meat: Could technology save animals and satisfy meat eaters? *J. Agric. Environ. Ethics*, 21(6):579–596, 11 July 2008.

[21] Hanna L Tuomisto and M Joost Teixeira de Mattos. Environmental impacts of cultured meat production. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 45(14):6117–6123, 15 July 2011.

[22] Carolyn S Mattick, Amy E Landis, Braden R Allenby, and Nicholas J Genovese. Anticipatory life cycle analysis of in vitro biomass cultivation for cultured meat production in the united states. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 49(19):11941–11949, 6 October 2015.

[23] Nathan Fiala. The value of cultured meat: An estimate of the externality costs of meat consumption. *Internet: http://www. new-harvest. org/img/files/fiala_2010. pdf [Feb. 5, 2013]*, 2010.

[24] Winston Churchill. Fifty years hence, December 1931.

[25] M A Benjaminson, J A Gilchriest, and M Lorenz. In vitro edible muscle protein production system (MPPS): stage 1, fish. *Acta Astronaut.*, 51(12):879–889, December 2002.

[26] Mark Post. The meat revolution, September 2015.

[27] Sam Harris and Uma Valeti. Meat without misery.

[28] Gerber, P.J., Steinfeld, H., Henderson, B., Mottet, A., Opio, C., Dijkman, J., Falcucci, A., Tempio, G. Tackling climate change through livestock: A global assessment of emissions and mitigation opportunities. Technical report, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2013.

[29] International Transport Forum. Reducing transport greenhouse gas emissions. Technical report, OECD, Leipzig, 2010.

[30] Climate Change Division. Methane emissions. http://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases/ch4.html, 15 March 2012. Accessed: 2016-2-7.

[31] United Nations Environment Programme. How close are we to the two degree limit?

[32] M M Mekonnen and A Y Hoekstra. *The green, blue and grey water footprint of farm animals and animal products*. PhD thesis, Engineering Technology (CTW), Delft, the Netherlands, 2010.

[33] M M Mekonnen and A Y Hoekstra. The green, blue and grey water footprint of crops and derived crop products. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 8(1):763–809, 20 January 2011.

[34] Barbara Rischkowsky and Dafydd Pilling. The state of the world's animal genetic resources for food and agriculture. Technical report, Commision for Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, 2007.

[35] Jay P Graham, Jessica H Leibler, Lance B Price, Joachim M Otte, Dirk U Pfeiffer, T Tiensin, and Ellen K Silbergeld. The animal-human interface and infectious disease in industrial food animal production: rethinking biosecurity and biocontainment. *Public Health Rep.*, 123(3):282–299, May 2008.

[36] Fernando Baquero, José-Luis Martínez, and Rafael Cantón. Antibiotics and antibiotic resistance in water environments. *Curr. Opin. Biotechnol.*, 19(3):260–265, June 2008.

[37] Prescription for trouble: Using antibiotics to fatten livestock. http://www.ucsusa.org/food_and_agriculture/our-failing-food-system/industrial-agriculture/prescription-for-trouble.html. Accessed: 2016-1-23.

[38] A Andremont. WHO | what to do about resistant bacteria in the food-chain? http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/93/4/15-030415/en/, April 2015. Accessed: 2016-2-4.

[39] Mary J Gilchrist, Christina Greko, David B Wallinga, George W Beran, David G Riley, and Peter S Thorne. The potential role of concentrated animal feeding operations in infectious disease epidemics and antibiotic resistance. *Environ. Health Perspect.*, 115(2):313–316, February 2007.

[40] WHO | antibiotic resistance. http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/antibiotic-resistance/en/, April 2015. Accessed: 2016-2-4.

[41] M Sprenger. WHO | how to stop antibiotic resistance? here's a WHO prescription. http://www.who.int/mediacentre/commentaries/stop-antibiotic-resistance/en/, 20 November 2015. Accessed: 2016-2-4.

[42] Philip Low, Jaak Panksepp, Diana Reiss, David Edelman, Bruno Van Swinderen, and Christof Koch. The cambridge declaration on consciousness. 7 July 2012.

[43] Animal welfare. http://ec.europa.eu/food/animals/welfare/index_en.htm, 17 December 2007. Accessed: 2016-3-3.

[44] Kent C Berridge and Morten L Kringelbach. Building a neuroscience of pleasure and well-being. *Psychol. Well Being*, 1(1):1–3, 24 October 2011.

[45] Donald R Griffin and Gayle B Speck. New evidence of animal consciousness. *Anim. Cogn.*, 7(1):5–18, January 2004.

[46] HSUS. An HSUS report: The welfare of animals in the meat, egg, and dairy industries. Technical report, Humane Society of the United States, January 2010.

[47] HSUS. An HSUS report: The welfare of animals in the pig industry. Technical report, Humane Society of the United States, January 2010.

[48] HSUS. An HSUS report: The welfare of intensively confined animals in battery cages, gestation crates, and veal crates. Technical report, Humane Society of the United States, July 2012.

[49] David Pimentel and Marcia Pimentel. Sustainability of meat-based and plant-based diets and the environment. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.*, 78(3 Suppl):660S–663S, September 2003.

[50] P W Gerbens-Leenes, S Nonhebel, and W P M F Ivens. A method to determine land requirements relating to food consumption patterns. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, 90(1):47–58, June 2002.

[51] M B M Bracke, S Edwards, G Geers, N E O'Connell, L Juul-Pedersen, and A Valros. The risks associated with tail biting in pigs and possible means to reduce the need for tail docking. In *Preparatory work for the future development of animal based measures for assessing the welfare of weaned, growing and fattening pigs including aspects related to space allowance, floor types, tail biting and need for tail docking*, pages 84–98. EFSA, Parma Italy, 2008.

[52] Heather Pickett. Report on the welfare of pigs in the EU in relation to current legislation and enforcement. Technical report, Compassion in World Farming, 15 June 2009.

[53] Http://www Vegsource Org/greg/ Gregory Lemire. The welfare of sows in gestation crates: A summary of the scientific evidence. https://web.archive.org/web/20071223155956/http://www.farmsanctuary.org/campaign/gestation_evidence.htm, 2004. Accessed: 2016-2-12.

[54] P H Hemsworthlt, J L Barnett, and G J Coleman. The Human-Animal relationship in agriculture and its consequences for the animal. *Anim. Welf.*, 2(1):33–51, 1 February 1993.

[55] W M Quinteiro-Filho, A Ribeiro, V Ferraz-de Paula, M L Pinheiro, M Sakai, L R M Sá, A J P Ferreira, and J Palermo-Neto. Heat stress impairs performance parameters, induces intestinal injury, and decreases macrophage activity in broiler chickens. *Poult. Sci.*, 89(9):1905–1914, September 2010.

[56] Jessica Vapnek Megan Chapman. FAO legislative study: Legislative and regulatory options for animal welfare. Technical report, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2010.

[57] Animal Equality. Squalor and suffering on award-winning british pig farms exposed by animal equality. http://www.animalequality.net/node/897, 31 May 2016. Accessed: 2016-6-18.

[58] Jacky Turner, Leah Garces, and Wendy Smith. *The Welfare of Broiler Chickens in the European Union: A Report by Compassion in World Farming Trust*. Compassion in World Farming Trust, 2003.

[59] Undercover investigations. http://www.mercyforanimals.org/investigations, 5 January 2015. Accessed: 2016-2-18.

[60] CompassionUSA. Factory farmers expose diseased chickens, 16 April 2016.

[61] Hanna L Tuomisto and Avijit G Roy. Could cultured meat reduce environmental impact of agriculture in europe? 4 October 2012.

[62] Bitten. Bitten 2016 // isha datar // on animal products without animals, 29 February 2016.

[63] Nicolas Genovese and Kris Notaro. The crusade for a cultured alternative to animal meat: An interview with nicholas genovese, PhD PETA. http://ieet.org/index.php/IEET/more/notaro20111005, 2011. Accessed: 2016-NA-NA.

[64] I Datar and M Betti. Possibilities for an in vitro meat production system. *Innov. Food Sci. Emerg. Technol.*, 11(1):13–22, January 2010.

[65] Zuhaib Fayaz Bhat and Hina Bhat. Animal-free meat biofabrication. *Am. J. Food Technol.*, (6):441–449, 2011.

[66] Peter H Diamandis and Steven Kotler. *Abundance: The future is better than you think*. Simon and Schuster, 2012.

[67] Mark J Post. Cultured meat from stem cells: challenges and prospects. *Meat Sci.*, 92(3):297–301, November 2012.

[68] Willem Frederik Van Eelen, Willem Jan Van Kooten, and Wiete Westerhof. Industrial scale production of meat from In-Vitro cell cultures, 25 June 1999.

[69] TNS Opinion & Social. Special eurobarometer 354: “Food-Related risks”. Technical report, European Commission, November 2010.

[70] Klaus G Grunert. Food quality and safety: consumer perception and demand. *Eur. Rev. Agric. Econ.*, 32(3):369–391, 1 September 2005.

[71] Mark J Post. An alternative animal protein source: cultured beef. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.*, 1328:29–33, November 2014.

[72] Magic meatballs. http://bistro-invitro.com/en/dishes/magic-meatballs/. Accessed: 2016-1-25.

[73] Global Agriculture Information Network. United kingdom product brief: Exotic and specialty meats. Technical report, USDA Foreign Agricultural Service, 21 February 2001.

[74] Exotic animals for sale - havocscope. http://www.havocscope.com/exotic-animals-for-sale/, 2014. Accessed: 2016-1-25.

[75] Florian Köhler and Susanne Wildner. *Consumer Concerns about Animal Welfare and the Impact on Food Choice*. PhD thesis, University of Kiel, November 1998.

[76] Mara Miele and Vittoria Parisi. *Consumer Concerns about Animal Welfare and Food Choice Strategies to Address Consumer*. PhD thesis, University of Pisa, February 2001.

[77] Ruth M W Yeung and Joe Morris. Food safety risk—consumer perception and purchase behavior. *British Food Journal*, 103(3):170–187, 31 March 2001.

[78] Gemma Harper and Spencer Henson. Consumer concerns about animal welfare and the impact on food choice. *EU FAIR CT98-3678, Centre for Food Economics Research, The University of Reading*, 2001.

[79] Hilary Meehan and Cathal Cowan. Food choice & consumer concerns about animal welfare in ireland. Technical report, The National Food Centre, April 2002.

[80] Pirjo Honkanen, Bas Verplanken, and Svein Ottar Olsen. Ethical values and motives driving organic food choice. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 5(5):420–430, 1 September 2006.

[81] Ulrich Enneking. Willingness-to-pay for safety improvements in the german meat sector: the case of the Q&S label. *Eur. Rev. Agric. Econ.*, 31(2):205–223, 1 June 2004.

[82] Monika J A Schröder and Morven G McEachern. Consumer value conflicts surrounding ethical food purchase decisions: a focus on animal welfare. *Int. J. Consum. Stud.*, 28(2):168–177, 1 March 2004.

[83] Animal welfare tops consumers' ethical wish list - 74% list this among the top factors which make a food brand ethical | mintel.com. http://www.mintel.com/press-centre/food-and-drink/74-of-consumers-list-animal-welfare-among-the-top-factors-which-make-a-food-brand-ethical. Accessed: 2016-1-29.

[84] Special Eurobarometer. Attitudes of EU citizens towards animal welfare. Technical report, European Commission, 2007.

[85] Robert M Chiles. Intertwined ambiguities: Meat, in vitro meat, and the ideological construction of the marketplace. *J. Consumer Behav.*, 12(6):472–482, 1 November 2013.

[86] Tomorrow's meatball: What we all could be eating 20 years from now. https://www.space10.io/journal/tomorrow-s-meatball-what-we-all-could-be-eating-20-years-from-now, 9 December 2015. Accessed: 2016-1-28.

[87] P D Edelman, D C McFarland, V A Mironov, and J G Matheny. Commentary: In vitro-cultured meat production. *Tissue Eng.*, 11(5-6):659–662, May 2005.

[88] Brian Krans and William A Morrison. Muscle biopsy. http://www.healthline.com/health/muscle-biopsy, 11 January 2016. Accessed: 2016-2-16.

[89] Carlo E A Jochems, Jan B F van der Valk, Frans R Stafleu, and Vera Baumans. The use of fetal bovine serum: ethical or scientific problem? *Altern. Lab. Anim.*, 30(2):219–227, March 2002.

[90] Patricia Pazos, Monica Boveri, Alessandra Gennari, Juan Casado, Fernando Fernandez, and Pilar Prieto. Culturing cells without serum: lessons learnt using molecules of plant origin. *ALTEX*, 21(2):67–72, 2004.

[91] Gerhard Gstraunthaler. Alternatives to the use of fetal bovine serum: serum-free cell culture. *ALTEX*, 20(4):275–281, 2003.

[92] Daniel Brunner, Jürgen Frank, Helmut Appl, Harald Schöffl, Walter Pfaller, and Gerhard Gstraunthaler. Serum-free cell culture: the serum-free media interactive online database. *ALTEX*, 27(1):53–62, 2010.

[93] Hideaki Fujita, Akiko Endo, Kazunori Shimizu, and Eiji Nagamori. Evaluation of serum-free differentiation conditions for C2C12 myoblast cells assessed as to active tension generation capability. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.*, 107(5):894–901, 1 December 2010.

[94] Mark Post. What if scientists are the new chefs?, September 2015.

[95] Isha Datar and Daan Luining. Mark post's cultured beef. http://www.new-harvest.org/mark_post_cultured_beef, 3 November 2015. Accessed: 2016-1-26.

[96] Isha Datar and Daan Luining. personal communication, 7 March 2016.

[97] Isha Datar and Gilonne D'Origny. New harvest strategic planning document. 2 March 2016.

[98] Allison Gleadle. Emerging food technologies: Novel protein sources as food. Technical report, Food Standards Agency, 11 November 2010.

[99] F van Duijne and A Visser. *Voorzorg voor voedsel- en productveiligheid: een kijkje in de toekomst*. Voedsel en Waren Autoriteit, Bureau Risicobeoordeling, 2010.

[100] G Cazaux, D Van Gijseghem, and L Bas. Alternatieve eiwitbronnen voor menselijke consumptie. een verkenning. rapport departement landbouw en visserij, afdeling monitoring en studie. januari 2010. *Depotnummer: D/2010/3241*, 36, 2010.

[101] Burger tasting london 2013, 7 August 2013.

[102] Our story. http://www.memphismeats.com/about-us/, 2016. Accessed: 2016-2-18.

[103] 3D vascularized tissue: The cultured steak. http://www.new-harvest.org/cultured_steak. Accessed: 2016-3-5.

[104] M A Lawson and P P Purslow. Differentiation of myoblasts in serum-free media: effects of modified media are cell line-specific. *Cells Tissues Organs*, 167(2-3):130–137, 2000.

[105] Algae, cyanobacteria and microbiological production of biofuels. http://www.biofuelstp.eu/algae-aquatic-biomass.html. Accessed: 2016-2-15.

[106] Raphael Slade and Ausilio Bauen. Micro-algae cultivation for biofuels: Cost, energy balance, environmental impacts and future prospects. *Biomass Bioenergy*, 53:29–38, June 2013.

[107] Rommie van der Welde and Marinus van Krimpen. Algae as a promising new type of animal feed. https://www.wageningenur.nl/en/newsarticle/Algae-as-a-promising-new-type-of-animal-feed.htm, 3 February 2015. Accessed: 2016-2-16.

[108] C S Mattick and B R Allenby. Cultured meat: The systemic implications of an emerging technology. In *2012 IEEE International Symposium on Sustainable Systems and Technology (ISSST)*, pages 1–6, May 2012.

[109] Adam Whitmore. Renewables growth predictions and accuracy | the energy collective. http://theenergycollective.com/onclimatechangepolicy/286586/why-have-iea-s-projections-renewables-growth-been-so-much-lower-out-tur, 14 October 2013. Accessed: 2016-2-21.

[110] M Metayer, C Breyer, and H J Fell. The projections for the future and quality in the past of the world energy outlook for solar PV and other renewable energy technologies. *31st European PV Solar Energy*, 2015.

[111] European Commission. Beef: Deadweight market prices, 16 March 2006. Title of the publication associated with this dataset: Agriculture and Rural Development.

[112] J N Goodwin and C W Shoulders. The future of meat: a qualitative analysis of cultured meat media coverage. *Meat Sci.*, 95(3):445–450, November 2013.

[113] Andras Forgacs. Leather and meat without killing animals. http://www.ted.com/talks/andras_forgacs_leather_and_meat_without_killing_animals. Accessed: 2016-2-18.

[114] Wim Verbeke, Pierre Sans, and Ellen J Van Loo. Challenges and prospects for consumer acceptance of cultured meat. *J. Integr. Agric.*, 14(2):285–294, February 2015.

[115] Sam harris asks: Would you eat cultured meat? http://www.thegoodfoodinstitute.org/sam-harris-asks-would-you-eat-cultured-meat, 5 February 2016. Accessed: 2016-2-17.

[116] Kyle Jaeger. You can now eat meat without killing the animal it came from. http://www.attn.com/stories/6565/kill-free-meat-products, 15 March 2016. Accessed: 2016-4-14.

[117] Kirstie McCrum. Would you eat this laboratory-grown 'meat'? http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/world-news/scientists-create-first-ever-laboratory-7602107, 21 March 2016. Accessed: 2016-4-14.

[118] New harvest review | animal charity evaluators. http://www.animalcharityevaluators.org/research/organizations/new-harvest-review/. Accessed: 2016-3-10.

Sentience Politics is an anti-speciesist political think-tank. We advocate a society which grants moral consideration to all sentient beings, regardless of their species membership. Our activities include political initiatives and the composition of scientific position papers, in order to encourage rational discussion on important issues.

Our philosophy is based on effective altruism: How can we use our limited resources (time and money) to reduce as much suffering as possible? Sentience Politics uses rationality and empirical science in order to identify and implement the most effective strategies. We also use this approach in order to select and prioritize the causes that we work on.

Sentience Politics was founded as a project of the Effective Altruism Foundation (EAF) in 2013. EAF is an independent think tank and project overseer founded at the intersection of science and ethics by a team of young, interdisciplinary individuals. It is a part of the fast-growing Effective Altruism movement, and aims to improve the lives of as many sentient beings as extensively as possible. In order to achieve this goal with limited resources, EAF uses rational thinking and evidence-based approaches.

Would you like to support our work? Please visit
http://sentience-politics.org/en/support/
for more information on several ways to support us.

SENTIENCE
POLITICS