2025 Dietary Guidelines: A Major Step Forward With Troubling Flaws

Michael B. Zemel, Ph.D.
January 12, 2026

Part 1

Every five years, the USDA and HHS release the Dietary Guidelines for Americans (DGAs). These are supposed to represent a consensus of the best current scientific thinking about what constitutes an optimal diet. They also have real policy implications, as they dictate school lunch programs, military rations, and nutrition assistance programs, effectively shaping key aspects of the American food landscape.

The newly released 2025–2030 Guidelines just dropped last week, and there's ample cause for both celebration and frustration. I'm incredibly pleased that the committee has finally caught up with modern science on the importance of protein and optimal (vs. just adequate) levels for health, but they remain stubbornly stuck in the past regarding saturated fat. This gives us a set of improved guidelines, but one that is internally contradictory. The result? The guidelines ask Americans to prioritize protein while simultaneously imposing a saturated fat guideline that limits the best sources of it, pushing us toward a nutritional tightrope walk.

Here is a breakdown of the good, the bad, and the scientifically confusing aspects of the new guidelines.

The Good News: The Great Protein Pivot

For decades, the DGAs have treated protein roughly the same way they treat carbohydrates and fat—just another macronutrient to balance. The 2025 guidelines mark a significant, positive shift. The new guidelines emphasize "nutrient-dense protein foods" far more strongly than in the past. They explicitly recognize that many Americans—particularly older adults looking to maintain muscle mass and metabolic health through aging—are likely under-consuming high-quality protein and that the old guideline was simply insufficient.

The new guidelines include a broad tent of recommendations: lean meats, poultry, eggs, and seafood, but also a significantly increased emphasis on plant-based sources like soy products, beans, lentils, nuts, and seeds. If you have been prioritizing protein in your diet—whether you are paleo or vegan—the government finally agrees with you.

The Paradox: The "Saturated Fat" Trap

Here is where the guidelines truly read like a report written by a committee (which of course they are), with internal inconsistencies among recommendations. The hard cap on saturated fat (less than 10% of calories) makes turning the protein recommendation into a reality either difficult or impossible, depending on your dietary pattern and preferred protein source.

Animal Protein: The Math Doesn't Work

Most high-quality animal protein comes naturally “packaged” with saturated fat. Steak, whole eggs, and full-fat yogurt are excellent sources of protein, but they also put you over the top of the recommended saturated fat limit. To follow the 2025 guidelines perfectly while relying primarily on animal sources of protein, you would have to exist almost entirely on boneless, skinless chicken breast, egg whites, and fat-free dairy products (which, when you think about it, are really ultra-processed and perhaps not really consistent with the guidelines). So you ask, what about fish? Good question. The guidelines encourage eating three or more servings of fish per week, and if you shift your protein to primarily fish, you do escape the protein-saturated fat paradox. But over-reliance on high quality fish (as a primary protein source rather than just three times per week) presents another set of challenges: mercury and cost. Subsisting on fish is much more expensive (unless you catch them yourself!) than other protein sources, and lower mercury fish such as wild-caught salmon are an expensive luxury that most families simply cannot afford to subsist on.

Plant Protein

The guidelines do heavily push non-meat alternatives (beans, lentils, soy), largely because they naturally solve the "saturated fat" math problem, and, I admit, they appeal to my vegetarian sensibilities. However, plant proteins are generally less digestible and have a less optimal amino acid profile; to get the same 30 grams of high-quality protein found in a small steak, you may need to consume a massive volume of beans or lentils. This comes with a "carbohydrate tax"—a significant load of calories and glucose that can be counterproductive for someone trying to maintain a lower carbohydrate profile (which is also consistent with the new guidelines).

By favoring plant proteins simply because they are low in saturated fat, the guidelines risk under-serving the aging population that needs dense, highly bioavailable protein to prevent muscle loss (sarcopenia).

The Science Flaw: Not All Saturated Fats Are Created Equal

The most frustrating aspect of the 10% saturated fat limit is that it is not built on a solid scientific foundation. Science has long since moved past treating saturated fat as a single, monolithic health villain.

Saturated fatty acids differ based on the length of their carbon chains, and these differences cause major differences in their associated biological effects and health risks:

- **Long-Chain Saturated Fats:** (Found predominantly in red meat). These are traditionally associated with raising LDL cholesterol, although not all of them do so.
- **Medium- and Short-Chain Fatty Acids:** (Found predominantly in dairy, coconut oil, and produced by gut bacteria). Short-chain fatty acids like butyrate (found in butter and full-fat dairy) act as fuel for gut cells and have anti-inflammatory properties. Medium-chain triglycerides (MCTs) are metabolized differently, often burned for energy rather than stored.

By lumping the beneficial fats found in full-fat fermented yogurt into the same category as the fat in a deep-fried fast-food burger, the guidelines miss the mark. Emerging research consistently suggests that full-fat dairy does *not* carry the same cardiovascular risks as other sources of saturated fat, and in some studies, is associated with better metabolic outcomes.

A Critical Look at the Evidence

Why is the DGA committee holding so tight to the 10% limit? It stems from the entrenched "Diet-Heart Hypothesis," which posits that Saturated Fat increases LDL Cholesterol, and LDL Cholesterol causes Cardiovascular Disease. However, this too needs a nuanced look, as it is well understood that the *type* of LDL matters. Saturated fat tends to increase the larger, less harmful particles. This is not to say that longer chain saturated fatty acids do not pose a health risk, but instead to suggest that lumping all saturated fats together is simply not justified and that we need to worry about what we replace saturated fat with. Overall, the strict 10% cap is not based on high-quality, randomized controlled trials showing that eating whole foods rich in saturated fat causes heart attacks but instead relies heavily on older observational data. While some of these data are compelling (again, for the longer chain saturated fats), we are still left with the problem that, by replacing saturated fat with refined carbohydrates (as Americans have now done for decades), heart disease risk may *increase* due to inflammation and insulin resistance.

The Takeaway

The 2025 Dietary Guidelines are a mixed bag.

The Wins: Recognition of the role of protein in healthy aging and metabolic stability, and appropriate adjustment of protein guidance. Focus on real food. Incorporation of lower carbohydrate options in dietary patterns.

The Fails: Obsession with saturated fats. A forced choice between "Franken-meat" (highly processed low-fat animal products) or plant-based proteins that present digestibility and protein quality issues, especially for older adults.

Practical advice? Celebrate the protein recommendation. Focus on whole food sources—meat, fish, eggs, dairy, *and* nutrient-dense plants like fermented soy (tempeh/natto) or lentils. But do not fear the naturally occurring fats that come along for the ride in highly nutritious foods like quality cheese or yogurt. The quality of the food source matters infinitely more than a single percentage point on a government fat chart.

[Next page: Part 2 – The Clash Between Health Policy (Dietary Guidelines) and Agricultural Policy]

Part 2 – The Clash Between Health Policy (Dietary Guidelines) and Agricultural Policy

While Part 1 highlighted the biological confusion in the 2025 Dietary Guidelines, Part 2 briefly tackles the economic absurdity. To be fair, the USDA may have the most difficult dual mandate in the federal government. On one hand, it is the public health agency responsible for telling Americans what to eat for optimal health (The Dietary Guidelines). On the other hand, it is the agricultural marketing agency responsible for ensuring American farmers sell as much product as possible (Agricultural Policy).

For decades, these two missions have co-existed in an uneasy truce. But the 2025 Guidelines have shattered that truce, exposing a massive rift between what the government tells us to eat and what it pays farmers to grow.

The "Real Food" Mandate vs. The "Commodity" Reality

The headline of the 2025 Guidelines is a full-throated endorsement of "Real Food." The text explicitly declares war on ultra-processed foods, urging Americans to ditch the center aisles of the grocery store in favor of whole meats, dairy, fruits, and vegetables.

This sounds great, until you look at the Farm Bill.

The vast majority of US agricultural subsidies do not go to the "real food" the guidelines now champion. They go to "commodity crops"—specifically corn, soy, and wheat. These are the raw materials of the very ultra-processed foods the USDA is now telling us to avoid.

- **We are told to eat:** Broccoli, bell peppers, blueberries, and grass-fed beef.
- **We subsidize:** High-fructose corn syrup, soybean oil, and feed corn for feedlot cattle.

By subsidizing the ingredients of junk food, the government artificially lowers the price of processed calories while leaving nutrient-dense "specialty crops" (the USDA's dismissive term for fruits and vegetables) to the whims of the free market. The result? The 2025 Guidelines are effectively telling low-income Americans to buy expensive, unsubsidized food while the government uses tax dollars to make the unhealthy alternative cheaper.

The School Lunch Impossible Math

This problem becomes painfully obvious when we consider the National School Lunch Program. It’s just not possible for school nutrition directors to follow the new guidelines with resources they receive. Here’s the paradox: The new guidelines call for nutrient-dense whole foods and a

reduction in added sugars and processing. But the actual reimbursement rates for school lunches is already inadequate and simply cannot cover the cost of fresh proteins and produce. Instead, schools rely heavily on USDA Commodities—surplus foods purchased by the government to support farm prices. Historically, this has meant cheese, ground beef, and processed pork. But this means that schools are given free high-fat commodities but are legally required to keep saturated fat under 10% of the meal's calories.

To solve this, schools get creative. They don't cook fresh steaks; they turn to industrial processing. They use "reformulated" patties, fillers, and fat-free flavored milks loaded with sugar to balance the "fat math." The 2025 Guidelines demand "unprocessed," but the USDA's own economic structure demands extensive processing to make the numbers work.

The "Checkoff" Paradox

Perhaps the most glaring hypocrisy is the existence of USDA "Checkoff Programs." These are mandatory fees farmers pay into a government-managed pot to advertise their products—think "Got Milk?" or "Beef: It's What's for Dinner."

The USDA oversees these massive marketing campaigns to convince you to eat *more* beef, pork, and dairy. Simultaneously, the DGA committee writes guidelines telling you that the fat in those very products is dangerous and should be strictly limited.

So, the USDA is effectively using your tax dollars to warn you about saturated fat, while using farmers' dollars to market that same fat to you during the Super Bowl.

The Bottom Line

The 2025 Dietary Guidelines are a step in the right direction philosophically, but they exist in a vacuum—the guidelines tell us to "Eat Real Food" while the entire weight of federal agricultural policy is designed to push out more and more cheap, processed foods.

Until national agricultural policy as manifested in the Farm Bill aligns with the Dietary Guidelines, "healthy eating" will remain a luxury product rather than a public health reality.